

**Marked as Dangerous: An Investigative Analysis of No-touch Torture Methods on  
Targeted Individuals**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Science in Psychology

Joyeux Noel Womac

Purdue University Global

2022

Author Note

Joyeux Noel Womac, Department of Graduate Psychology, Purdue University Global.  
The author wishes to express appreciation to family, friends, peers, Purdue Global staff, and especially the brave souls coming forward to share the atrocities impacting their lives. Address correspondence concerning this thesis to Joyeux "Joy" Noel Womac, [jnw305@gmail.com](mailto:jnw305@gmail.com).

### **Abstract**

The analysis examined participants suffering trauma from aspects of no-touch torture, such as gangstalking or organized stalking. The secondary aim was to establish common complaints in a 31-item anonymous online survey using 184 participants. A quantitative analysis summarized the demographics and consensus on no-touch torture experiences. The questionnaire excluded a perpetrator headcount, asset stripping, intellectual property theft, family relationships, animal cruelty, medical, criminal, employment history, and property damage/theft. The primary responses covered 40 U.S. states and 33 countries, mainly of non-political, single, White women, between the ages 45-54 with some education, typically unemployed with a blue-collar background. The activity occurred for more than ten years, as early as 1964, at the hands of corrupt law enforcement and intelligence agencies. Participants alleged these groups had ties to human trafficking and mass murder/active shootings and also targeted others nearby. They claimed to be involved in other crimes. Respondents asserted these activities derived from illegal testing and experimenting, producing the effects of dehydration, diminished thoughts, eyesight/red eyes, hearing, depleted salt and glucose levels, and red blood cell reduction. Most shared symptoms of Havana syndrome, Morgellons disease, active trauma, or depression. Many resorted to alcohol or substance abuse to dampen the effects and referred to their situation as a torture/targeting program. These new metrics explored several correlations and shed new light on the trauma based phenomenon.

Keywords: include five keywords (targeted individuals, gangstalking, no-touch torture, Havana syndrome, and human trafficking)

**Table of Contents**

Literature Review	4
Summary and Research Question	16
Method	18
Participants	19
Measures	20
Procedures	21
Data Management	22
Results and Statistical Analysis	22
Discussion	24
Implications	25
Limitations	26
Similarities and Differences	26
Remedies	28
Conclusion	29
References	31
Appendix A: IRB Letter of Approval	34
Appendix B: Correspondence Redacted for Privacy	35
Appendix C: Research Announcement	36
Appendix D: Informed Consent Forms	37
Appendix E: Survey Development Plan	41
Appendix F: Measures	43
Appendix G: Tables	49

## **Marked as Dangerous: An Investigative Analysis of No-Touch Torture Methods on Targeted Individuals**

Sheridan et al. (2020) defined gangstalking or organized stalking as multiple individuals who stalk, threaten, and harass another to destroy one's life. A 50-case assessment revealed that .17% of men and .66% of women who described these events showed symptoms of a mental illness. However, the United Nations Human Rights Council (2020) released a report disclosing the misuse of technological innovations by organized criminals, corporate actors, and governments to target people *remotely*. The previous research conflicted with the recent official U.N. statement on torture and diminished the experiences of the afflicted.

Gangstalking/organized stalking was one of those practices. The U.N. Human Rights Council (2020) further shared capabilities of nanotechnology, neurotechnology, biomedical and pharmaceutical sciences, artificial intelligence (A.I.), robotics, directed energy weapons, and voice-to-skull technology performed remotely to inflict severe pain, trauma, and suffering on another. These deviant entities could compartmentalize, delete, and manipulate information to avoid detection. The combination of techniques destabilized the psychological and physical needs of the person known as a targeted individual. This current review explored previous gangstalking/targeted individual scholarly works and additional aspects from different perspectives and compared them with a recent anonymous online study.

### **Literature review**

The current research expressed a limited understanding of no-touch torture capabilities like gangstalking of targeted individuals. Perpetrators funneled taxpayer or private funds to create negative experiences through defamation, slander, and crazy-making campaigns on a

single person. The practices entailed sophisticated gaslighting mechanisms to direct coercive control as they falsely marked their prey as *dangerous*, *crazy*, or the *enemy*. The label introduced a way to discredit and devalue the person as part of the break one's will playbook to destroy all aspects of a person's life. The scripted tactics displayed a form of entrapment as it drove up engagement to terrorize and torture the person into a forced narrative as they lured the individual into a greater strategic operation. The fair game approach also served as a propaganda tool to undermine human, legal, public or political interests as they extended the criminal enterprise such as human trafficking, mass murders, active shooting, or other crimes.

Complainants started filing effective statements with better evidence and reoriented the anchoring bias from mental illness to mental health injury and physical trauma as they proved more of these cases. The literature review broke down the concepts into four sections: gangstalking/targeted individual analyses, the torture environment construct, impact, and those who benefit. This review built upon previous articles, victim input, and other sources to provide a basis for the hypothesis.

### **Current Gangstalking Studies**

Sheridan and James (2015) conducted a study on gangstalking (organized stalking/group stalking) using characteristics set aside from typical stalking and found that 128 of the 1113 respondents met the gangstalking/group stalking definitions. The evaluation offered everyday practices that targeted individuals endured. The primary purpose was to identify what gangstalking meant to survivors. The team formed the description as three or more people dedicated to destroying one's life through stalking, threatening, or harassing actions. The secondary purpose provided results from a previous psychological or behavioral condition. The

researchers broadened an under-researched subject by restricting the analysis to at least three participating perpetrators with a 92-item anonymous online questionnaire (Sheridan & James, 2015). The questions contained multiple choice and space to provide additional answers. Lastly, the examination integrated trauma-related symptoms to determine validity and reliability through the self-report measure on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

The primary responses indicated 108 white women with an average age of 45.6 years during the survey (Sheridan & James, 2015), and the average age was 38.8 when the activity began. The ongoing gangstalking mean was 95 months and some said activity stopped at 54 months. The tactics ranged from typical stalking behaviors to very bizarre ones. A list outlined the following unusual events: collaboration between multiple agencies, hostile operatives in the victim's workplace or their children at school, everyone on the street play-act a role for the victim to see, surveillance by cameras placed throughout the city, a docile dog replaced with a foul-tempered dog, 24-hr electronic surveillance involving teams of men in black vans, more than a thousand people involved, repeated sexual assaults in their sleep, traffic lights manipulated to go red on approach, staff of shops and libraries involved in the group stalking, mind interference, insertion of alien thoughts, voice to skull technology or voice to skull messages, and remote enlargement of bodily organs.

Finally, the team summarized 128 gang stalking cases (Sheridan & James, 2015) of stalking behaviors they deemed impossible and fit the delusional or psychotic definition by the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders DSM-5 (DSM, 2013). They also conceived these statements belonged in the false claims category. Conversely, the team pointed to possibilities of other groups that could be responsible

such as extremely expensive and elaborate behavior organized by government agencies or those with substantial personal wealth (Sheridan & James, 2015). The team encouraged possible associations other than hypothesis testing. Facilitating a field investigation with specialized equipment and advanced training can explore the organized group concept. The effort may increase one's understanding beyond the data and gain cultural competency on these occurrences.

Sheridan et al. (2020) expanded on the 2015 gangstalking phenomenon. The authors collected samples of 50 self-published online accounts using a mixed design method of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The results showed that 0.66% of adult women and 0.17% of adult men encountered these events. The team identified terms such as "targeted individual," "group stalking," "victims of gangstalking," and "T.I." were eligible for the study. The research highlighted familiar categories with targeted individuals and noted how the activity continued. Sheridan et al. (2020) categorized all victim comments for assessment. The most notable: one victim visited seven psychologists, and another relocated to three different countries to no avail. Another survivor said the incidents began within the last few months, the longest for 22 years, and said other people surrounding them experienced targeting/no-touch torture. The researchers claimed at least three offenders can be involved. The findings gave a basis for what targeted individuals experienced and identified these patterns as psychological warfare.

Lang et al. (2020) synthesized the concepts between Haunted People Syndrome and gangstalking (group stalking) events from the Sheridan and James study (2015) of 128 cases. The team created two categories: lone stalking (one person) and group stalking (three or more). The authors defined Haunted People Syndrome as the experience of a recurrent perception of anomalous events objectively and subjectively. The researchers reanalyzed the Sheridan and

James (2015) 128 gangstalking survey sample using delusional and non-delusional accounts. These gangstalking episodes with supernatural elements consisted of the following: scripted street theater events, gaslighting of witnesses, increasing frequency and progression of ongoing surveillance, satellites, and stalking themes. The incidents existed because these "entity experiences" (Lang et al., 2020) were the following: angels, demons, gods, Men in Black, shamanic spirit guides, apparitions, and extra-terrestrials. Both categories shared a conventional theme of predictable anomalies under the Rasch model of signs and symptoms. The results also possessed centrally structured phenomena from familiar sources with no signs of contagious processes from symptom perception. The team defined the last concept as psychogenic illness or a mass group of people who simultaneously became sick for no legitimate reason.

However, the two categories of gangstalking (group stalking) and Haunted People Syndrome seemed contradictory based on the criteria. Gangstalking or group stalking emphasized harm in a manufactured, scripted construct. The other described unpredictable supernatural events and otherworldly encounters with a capacity to harm or benefit the person or environment. A more suitable location for the data collection on this type of research would be in well-known supernatural places such as Somerset, KY (International Paranormal Museum and Research Center) or Uintah Basin, UT (Skinwalker Ranch) and modify criteria while immersed in the surroundings for prolonged periods.

Lustig et al. (2021) performed clinical observations on 50 random video posts of self-identified targeted individuals and interpreted certain behaviors as gangstalking. The team provided a multimodal discourse analysis on gangstalking using social semiotics (semantics) or understand the meaning of signs after reviewing the YouTube video. This evaluation involved a



systematic way to view videos to transcribe and code into themes. The process extracted three main points: victims expressed hostility toward those they recorded, rejected a mentally ill diagnosis, and engaged in pleasant interactions with online viewers.

Moreover, the team (Lustig et al.,2021) called this condition a novel persecutory belief system as victims claimed a vast network of individuals in the community who harassed, followed, or watched them. The authors suggested clinicians engaged sufferers with an ambiguous approach when discussing their interpretation of sign-using behavior known as semiotics. The assessment neglected the known practice of flash mob relay-style operations or organized groups willing to sensitize others in a traumatizing way for sport or profit.

Xuan and MacDonald (2019) began a linguistics analysis on gangstalking through the targeted individual (T.I.)/gangstalking Facebook group discussions). The goal was to see if groups contributed to psychopathology through societal reinforcement effects in an echo chamber (an environment known to reinforce similar opinions or thoughts) or if they were like-minded individuals who provided a sense of belonging and nurturing support. Many survivors gravitated to support groups to offset the forced isolation and embraced like-minded people. The authors compared samples of targeted individuals with schizophrenic language from an analysis tool called Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) textual coding. The research group consolidated the information into a database of Facebook group discussion posts.

Xuan and MacDonald (2019) considered social media an echo chamber of distressing thoughts and contagion of malevolent intentions. The scientists calculated online posts from targeted individuals (TI) and schizophrenic online forum posts with contrary aspects based on more words per sentence, emphasizing cognitive word user abnormalities, self-focused

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

10

attributions, and negative emotions than other forums. The comparison between T.I. group postings and someone who suffered a psychosis lacked compelling evidence. Xuan and MacDonald (2019) also advised more research on these T.I. groups. Redundancies from online posts and the same users can dilute studies and skew results. Furthermore, future studies between targeted individuals, refugees, or Holocaust survivors may provide better analysis with the LIWC tool as both experienced prolonged traumatic environments.

### **Torture Environments**

Kira et al. (2013) analyzed 181 men and women with a meta-analysis of 40 countries. The torture definition (Kira, 2017) described cumulative traumas from different trauma types between the tortured and the torturer. The torturer enacted on behalf of a more powerful entity or group in a similar manner targeted individual shared. The institution followed a particular ideology, ordering the torturer (perpetrator) to dehumanize or project their prejudices onto the tortured (targeted individual). The victims subscribed to political, government, spiritual, or other motives when telling their stories. The torture data (Kira et al., 2013) calculated the variability between 3% to 85.5% for Depression and from 0% -99% for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

The authors pointed out detainees of sexual torture became suicidal, disassociated, or psychotic. Non-sexually tortured victims described function deficits, psychotic symptoms, increased association, irreversible neuroendocrine damage, cardiovascular system, and neurological damage. Specialized medical exams and the psychological tests by the authors may unlock the cause of external influences on targeted individuals. The limitations (Kira et al., 2013) excluded life adversities such as discrimination or oppression outside the torture effects and the

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

11

possible over or under reporting of events. Overall, more focus should be on cumulative trauma disorder as part of a torture or terrorist victim diagnostic as it related to torture and targeted individuals (DSM, 2013).

Sales et al. (2021) conducted an exploratory study on the reliability and validity of the Torturing Environment Scale (TES) on 201 Basque torture survivors. The group profiled detention facilities from 1965 to 2015 (since Francisco Franco's dictatorship in Spain) and observed how authorities denied survivors access to independent doctors, attorneys, families, or friends. The author's definition of torture was to break one's will and impede the self-determination of another, take control of all aspects of one's life, and change the core elements of one's identity to the perpetrator's interest (Perez-Sales, 2022).

The country experimented with torture as part of its social control and anti-terrorism policies using young people with an average age of 24 years old (Sales et al., 2021). The evaluation illustrated how state-sponsored torture existed (also a monitoring tool) and gave the basis for inflicting trauma on a select population. Historical records exhibited how governments frequently engaged in torture and pursued discussion on the ethics of these events. Capitalist societies gave logic-based reasons (Perez-Sales, 2022) to assert social control. They also catered to future enterprises as they explored different techniques of contemporary torture. The military police forces doled out harsher torture practices than non-military police with infinite degrading, cruel, or inhuman ways. Survivors of technological attacks revealed the same effects. The TES (Sales et al., 2021) may be a tool to summarize subjective experiences with good and adverse consequences of torturing environments.

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

12

The Istanbul Protocol Project Basque Country (Spain) Working Group used a United Nations torture environment standard for documentation. The authors identified and assessed typical torture practices to attack basic human needs (breaking one's will) and placed them into sections. The most relevant variables (Sales et al., 2021) included gender, the type of security forces, and the timeframe (in decades from 1980 to the present) of the torture. Interestingly, the police issued environmental manipulation through fear, extreme pain, and threats compared to the regional and national corps levels. The culprits reversed Maslow's hierarchy of needs approaching ways to focus on their subject's autonomy, competence, and relevance with continued deprivation and subjugation of no-touch torture.

Sales et al. (2021) deduced how people had different torturing environments and experiences. Remarkably, men reported more physical pain and women more sexual torture and psychological manipulation. Detentions later incorporated more psychological attacks through sequential years. The checklist's infinite torture practices proved challenging to quantify and limited the analysis. A modified TES tool might prove a versatile trauma metric for practitioners to attain a further understanding on contemporary torture and remote technology.

Russell (2017) reviewed Milgram's 1960s experiment of 780 participants and indicated 65% of the people followed authoritarian orders to inflict electric shocks on someone. Targeted individuals described similar trauma-based scenarios as they suffered at the hands of bad actors. Milgram achieved his goal of authoritarian obedience using an organizational process instructing one experimenter (authority/perpetrator) and one learner (targeted individual) to increase the intensity of electric shocks in 60-minute intervals. The analysis drew links between the

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

13

experiment and those obedient to authority as a recreation of the Holocaust event in a controlled laboratory setting.

The Milgram's experiment and the Holocaust correlation provided compelling discoveries. The author (Russell, 2017) remarked how Hitler's (Nazi) plan singled out German Jews as a moral or genetic threat to Germany from a gene pool of inferior and superior groups. The Nazi party elected to isolate, sterilize, and exterminate people for this reason. The propaganda motivated ordinary German citizens to despise Jews and influenced them to harm them voluntarily with enthusiasm. Accordingly, the Milgram experiment and Holocaust shared attributes of authoritarian influence and directed ordinary people to inflict pain on someone willingly. Survivors asserted these no-touch torture programs aligned with the same Nazi party agenda.

Administrators in the Milgram experiment applied similar authority with rational techniques to overcome any objection of the experimenter (perpetrator) to maximize (Russell, 2017) harm to the learner (targeted individual). A particular person or group could label another as inferior, dangerous, or crazy and encourage others to attack with the no-touch torture approach. The experimenter (perpetrator) usurped the false authoritarian role or status to continue harm toward the learner (targeted individual). Antagonists singled out others with impunity, as in the Holocaust, and expressed such hate and discontent towards them. This study depicted a correlation with the Milgram's experiment, the Holocaust, and targeted individuals and how far others were willing to go under forced guidance. A percentage of human beings may not have the capacity to stand against authoritarian based guidance.

### **Impact of No-touch Torture**

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

14

Eichensehr (2021) assessed reports in 2016 by a Central Intelligence Agency Officer of anomalous health incidents in Havana, Cuba. Targeted individuals described the same health anomalies and rarely received recognition or a proper investigation. Over 130 U.S. personnel described similar issues abroad as time progressed (Eichensehr, 2021). Multilevel agencies (Eichensehr, 2021) created a Health Incident Response Task Force to analyze symptoms of the following: painful headaches, nausea, dizziness, pain in one ear, pressure, and strange sounds, all originating from a particular direction, with some claiming recurring and chronic pain compared to earlier findings. Authorities deduced the health issues to cognitive deficits and vestibular disturbances with no initial explanation of the mechanism of injury or process of exposure. Targeted individuals (both federal and non-federal employees) described symptoms of Havana syndrome the same as those who received a diagnosis. Currently, an increase of federal employees reported Havana Syndrome symptoms globally and received compensation for the debilitating effects. Unfortunately, non-federal employees paid out-of-pocket expenses to assess these same symptoms and pursued efforts to overturn decisions on incorrect diagnoses.

Bandura and Carpenter (2018) evaluated 2,266 studies regarding artificial electromagnetic fields (EMF), microwave radiation, and radiofrequency (RF) electromagnetic radiation related to in-vitro and in-vivo studies in the human, plant, and animal populations and experimental studies. The duo observed how manufactured electromagnetic fields such as wireless communications and their associated infrastructure (Internet of Things, aka IoT) and 5G effects increased ten times beyond the naturally low energy fields and impacted all living things. To better explain, the bad actors modified these effects to amplify the frequencies and radiation levels remotely with military-grade weapons systems to specifically target a person(s), in

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

15

conjunction with gang stalking tactics. The activity varied in progression and frequency. The criminal enterprise exploited these electric clouds surrounding their victim to enhance the no-touch torture subjective experience as it caused physical and mental health injuries.

Bandura and Carpenter (2018) clarified 68.2% illustrated significant health and biological effects of artificial electromagnetic field exposure. Also, a finding in experimental research indicated 89% with significant effects of high oxidative stress and DNA damage from radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation. Targeted individuals asserted similar situations of these unusual effects. Furthermore, scientists addressed these dangerous levels of global frequencies to the World Health Organization and the United Nations in hopes to mitigate the circumstances. More peer-reviewed research may address correlations between torture environments and the manipulation of smart cities, information and communication technology (ICT) systems, intelligence-led policing, and geofencing grids, utilities monitoring, and sensors synced with these artificially augmented fields. These systems provided potential opportunities to test, experiment, monitor, manipulate, or sensitize a person or population in the geographical area.

McAmis et al. (2022) used an anonymous survey with 6,603 respondents from all over the country on healthcare providers' knowledge of human trafficking. The demographic collected information based on the training and knowledge in a healthcare setting. The authors used a qualitative approach using open-ended questions for content analysis. They discovered less than 42% acquired formal human trafficking training and 93% felt they would benefit with an upgrade in this knowledge.

The statistics showed human trafficking as a \$150 billion-dollar industry and the second-

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

16

largest source of income for organized crime (McAmis et al., 2022). The human trafficking figures indicated 40.3 million people were affected and revealed a U.S. estimate of 1.3 per thousand victims. Also, healthcare providers encountered 88% of the human trafficking victims (mainly underage females) paid a visit at a health facility undetected. The main ailments were depicted as these: sexual abuse, malnutrition, mental illness and physical injury from physical violence, and infectious diseases. Targeted individuals often self-described their human trafficking experiences without recognition and saw how organized criminal enterprises benefitted from their no-touch torture. Healthcare workers could receive a pay increase once they earned specialized certifications to address the complex physical and emotional needs of sufferers.

Sarteschi (2018) reviewed four case studies between the ages of 29 and 41 of primarily Black and Vietnamese males were connected to targeted individuals, mass murder, and gangstalking. The researchers collected open-source data from the sample criteria. The study gave a descriptive and exploratory approach with no definitive conclusions. The article alluded to omnipotent law enforcement and government entities allegedly operating behind the scenes of these events. The author detailed the nuances of how victims resorted to social media posts, audio and video tapes, and manifestos as an outlet before they took aggressive, lethal action to raise awareness (Sarteschi, 2018). The demographic limitations presented a challenge of its small sample of only four males.

### **Summary and Research Question**

Sheridan and James (2015) found 128 cases in gangstalking studies fit the criteria of delusion, psychosis or by organized groups like governments or wealthy people. Sheridan et al.



## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

17

(2020) studied 50 gangstalking (self-identified targeted individuals) cases and determined delusional symptoms and noted others surrounding the victim also reported similar experiences. Lustig et al. (2020) reanalyzed Sheridan and James's (2015) gangstalking study and compared supernatural episodes with those cases. Based on symptom perception, they determined the complainants had Haunted People Syndrome with no signs of contagious processes. Lustig et al. (2021) assessed 50 random online gangstalking videos (self-identified as targeted individuals) and concluded they had novel persecutory belief system disorder.

Sarteschi (2018) compared four gangstalking (self-identified as targeted individuals) cases involving mass murder and stated the victims had feelings of psychosis, persecution, and delusions. Xuan and MacDonald (2019) found a lack of substantive evidence characteristic to those with psychosis from their analysis between schizophrenic and targeted individual groups online groups. The investigative assessment between the Milgram experiment and the Holocaust revealed an assessment of 65% of 780 people followed orders to shock others (cause trauma) and showed obedience to authority to cause harm. Houck and Repke (2017) concluded people had variations of severe trauma and PTSD in the 181-country torture environment survey. Sales et al. (2021) studied 201 Basque (Spain) torture survivors who suffered different trauma depending on male or female gender. Eichensehr (2021) reviewed 130 federal employee cases of Havana syndrome and found the effects originated from radio or electromagnetic frequencies designed to injure (traumatize). Bandura and Carpenter (2018) looked at 2,266 cases of manufactured electromagnetic fields increased ten times beyond the naturally low levels of magnetic fields and implicated damage (trauma) to the mind and body. McAmis et al. (2022) evaluated 6,603 healthcare workers open to enhanced human trafficking training. The human trafficking interest

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

18

allowed opportunity to help targeted individuals because most recognized the criminal intent behind the attacks.

The literature review suggested inconsistencies in mental health diagnoses for targeted individuals such as delusional, Haunted People Syndrome, novel persecutory belief syndrome, psychotic, or schizophrenic symptoms from gangstalking (no-touch torture) based on scholarly articles by Sheridan and James (2015), Sheridan et al. (2020), Lang et al. (2020), Lustig et al. (2021), and Sarteschi (2018). Also, Kira et al. (2013, 2017), Houck and Repke (2017), Russell (2017), Sales et al. (2021), Eichensehr (2021), and Bandura and Carpenter (2018) described organized groups capable of creating torture environments or a result of severe trauma. Sheridan and James (2015) also expressed the alternate possibility of wealthy people and governments able to finance slow kill campaigns. Xuan and MacDonald (2019) could not confirm characteristics of psychosis in their analysis between gangstalking and linguistics. Also, Lang et al. (2020) could not validate psychogenic illness with Haunted People Syndrome and gangstalking comparison. The bulk of the gangstalking/targeted individual research emphasized on the original Sheridan and James 2015 instead of replicating the process with additional test subjects. Certain studies touched on the involvement of organized groups and dismissed them as not probable at all. The majority lacked the background on ways organized groups engaged in multiple crimes and corruption. The current research aimed to address this concern and posed the vital question: Can a targeted individual suffer trauma through no-touch torture by organized groups?

### **Method**

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

19

The current research with the support of the Purdue Global IRB approval (Appendix A), examined if no-touch torture caused trauma for a targeted individual. The analysis detailed a quantitative design through an anonymous online questionnaire to self-identify as a targeted individual. It was to describe common complaints, experiences, and circumstances of targeting activities by various modes of no-touch torture and the organized groups who remotely operated them. The additional research included input about trauma, no-touch torture characteristics and environments, impact, and organized groups who benefit from help using various sources. The figures may demonstrate the nature of gangstalking, no-touch torture capabilities, motives, and those responsible for the no-touch torture. The IRB of Purdue University Global approved the research (See Appendix A).

### **Participants**

The researcher recruited people to use an anonymous online questionnaire with a data collection aim between 100-200 people in the targeted individual community. The study excluded those outside the age of 18 - 99 and required no specific characteristics of age, sex, educational background, or ethnic traits. Distribution of the research announcement emerged through Facebook posts or groups, a created website, or shared with others. Participants viewed the survey link in the announcement and chose to participate or screened out if ineligible.

Participants completed the survey in SurveyMonkey, which offered bot and fraud detection to ensure questionnaire quality and access to a larger population. The questionnaire was accessible from any country. Several research announcements occurred on Facebook groups/pages and circulated by interested parties or sent by email to the following:

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

20

Alainah Hacker is CEO of Accugentix L.L.C., [www.accugentix.com](http://www.accugentix.com). She serves as an expert in bioweapons, Pentagon-KGB contractor, and member of an international task force. Her company researches biological signaling to treat illnesses or conditions and has access to targeted individuals who may take the survey through social media.

L.A. Dubay, a mental health professional, and owner of Recreation and Recovery Services, [www.recreationandrecoveryservices.com](http://www.recreationandrecoveryservices.com), helps clients including targeted individuals to overcome trauma to focus on solutions and healing.

A specially created website: [graduatetargetedindividualtraumasurvey.weebly.com](http://graduatetargetedindividualtraumasurvey.weebly.com). Weebly's offered terms of service permit such research postings; see [www.weebly.com/app/help/us/en/topics/changes-to-our-privacy-notice-terms-of-service-and-new-tools](http://www.weebly.com/app/help/us/en/topics/changes-to-our-privacy-notice-terms-of-service-and-new-tools). These contacts may forward the Research Announcement to those who know targeted individuals or self-identify to participate in the study. The research announcement remained for four weeks with reminders to complete the survey.

### **Measures**

The study aimed to measure a correlation between no-touch torture and trauma. The predominant variables gave metrics from the demographics, no-touch torture methods, quality of life impact, motive, organized groups who benefit, and torture environments. The modified version of the Likert Scale assessed whether organized groups played a part and the trauma impact they had on a targeted individual's life. The degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement received a rating on a 5-point Likert Scale for most questions with 16 items. The additional questions came in a multiple-choice format of 14 items. Some questions had "Other" with free text options.

### **Demographics Questionnaire**

SurveyMonkey asked the following questions: location, age, race/ethnicity, relationship status, political views, gender identity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, education level, and occupation before the no-touch torture occurred, the year, age, and time length when no-touch torture began. This information described the sample of those who took the survey and assessed commonalities in the organized groups responsible for the targeting. The demographic section had options of "Prefer not to answer" or to specify "Other" when applicable using 12 demographic questions. See Appendix B for further information.

Survey provided primarily closed-ended questions from previous works and credible sources. Questions included socio-demographics and critical content related to the research question or suggested by the literature review. See Appendix E for the full text of the survey. The survey questions were based on the following assessment objectives (see Appendix E for the complete Survey Development Plan). A doctoral-level researcher specializing in survey design reviewed and edited the survey, improving its face and content validity.

Face validity suggested the survey measured what it aimed to measure based on a simple reading of the questions. Content validity indicated the instrument represented all critical aspects of the construct it should measure; an expert appraisal can partially assess content validity (Miller & Lovler, 2015). Nevertheless, the new survey had no existing data on the reliability or validity of the questions or the instrument beyond the face and content validity.

### **Procedures**

Participants who engaged in the anonymous study received the research announcement by Facebook post. Willing participants logged into the URL included in the announcement and

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

22

sent it to the SurveyMonkey site. Participants were introduced to the consent notification with an agree or disagree option. They proceeded to the screening questions if they chose to agree. Any nonconsensual responses were deleted. Once validated, the respondent was allowed to take the questionnaire one time. Only one person per survey between 18-99 years of age were eligible to participate.

### **Data Management**

No I.P. addresses were collected to ensure the anonymity of those who took the survey. The data was transferred from SurveyMonkey into an SPSS database for analysis. The results came in aggregate form to protect participants' identities. No one had access to the data, only in the form of physically completed surveys maintained on an encrypted flash drive kept in a locked file cabinet at home. The researcher was the only party accessing the password-protected SPSS dataset and contained no coded identifiers and to maintain anonymity. Incomplete, fraudulent, nonconsensual, or ineligible responses were removed from the dataset. Some were placed in a preference not to answer or N/A if they completed most of the questions. The researcher created additional categories to accommodate similar responses for efficiency.

The researcher stored all electronic data on an encrypted flash drive, not on any computer hard drive. The researcher planned to retain the data set and related files for a minimum of five years after the study completion in case questions arise about the analyses. After five years, the data will be destroyed using the current Department of Defense data destruction standards. The researcher may choose an affordable technique, such as encryption, pending technology at the time.

### **Results and Statistical Analysis**

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

23

The data was collected from SurveyMonkey after 184 participants completed the questionnaire over four weeks. The results were transferred into the Statistical Package of Social Sciences, version 29 (SPSS-29). The figures were analyzed and transferred to the dataset to verify description statistics. Scores from each section were examined and compared for statistical significance.

### **Participants and Demographic Characteristics**

Demographics revealed factors of age, marital status, political viewpoint, education level, occupation status, and location as significant trends. A total of 184 completed the study, with 151 from the United States (82.1%) and 33 countries (15.9%). The respondents were primarily from California (13.2%), white (67.9%), single (46.7%), female (55.5%), age range of 45-54 (28.8%), non-political (25%), college but no degree (30.2%) unemployed (23.9%) and in the blue-collar private sector (17.4%). See Table 2 in Appendix G.

Demographic responses provided one unknown race because of the MK Ultra breeding program, torture began since birth, torture occurred off and on for decades, and another separated from their loved one due to the targeting. Additional respondents disclose varying ages, locations, and educational or occupational backgrounds. Some answers were moved to a new "Disabled" category, such as disabled veteran, disabled, former Walmart employee, disabled by Mind Control by God, and a sawmill worker, to mention a few. Political view responses were consolidated in the "Other" section because they specified other parties or general terms such as Independent, Socialist, or a gray area of following politics but did not vote. Also, multiple responses in the "Multiethnic/other" and "Other, please specify" categories to reduce

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

24

redundancies in the table. Some responses seemed unclear if the majority suffered a job or relationship loss because of their cumulative experiences. See Table 2 in Appendix G.

### **Torture Environment Characteristics**

Torture environment responses primarily showed “most likely” to the practices, quality of life impact, motive, and organized groups that benefit (See Tables 3 and 4 in Appendix G). Some unique responses on motive were as followed: being homeless, drug addiction, a case with the FBI, anti-war activism, mafia, musical talent, related to a targeted individual, to commit election fraud overseas and in the U.S., rejected CIA recruitment, switched at birth, brain data mining, and a medical mistake, obstruction of justice, national security, war crime investigations, and stop human rights. (See Table 4 in Appendix G). Some gave unusual responses of organized groups that benefit like these: COVID-19 vaccine bio firms/self-assembling graphene, Amazon/Anthem, European cult, Church of Scientology, Boeing, Lockheed Martin, Democratic National Committee, corrupt politicians, space aliens, or a variety of gangs. Also, some of the people indicated white supremacists, Chinese related information including cyber-spy hardware, hackers, trafficked by billionaires and heads of state, Big Pharma, Dow Corning, Monsanto, World Economic Forum, Bilderberg members, and Macy Foundation. (See Table 5 in Appendix G). Respondents disclosed “Most likely” for links to human trafficking, other crimes involved, others surrounding them were targeted, mass murder/active shooting, and felt they were in a tortured/targeting program. (See Table 6 Appendix G).

### **Discussion**

The study's purpose was to assess the relationship between targeted individuals and no-touch torture. The results gave collateral evidence despite limitations to the original hypothesis



## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

25

asserting victims can suffer trauma. Further analysis also confirmed the main complaints of no-touch torture in the survey. The information gave guidance on how others remotely target a person as referenced in the initial research questions from the thesis literature review.

### **Implications**

The study highlighted a new perspective on how one can suffer trauma through various means of no-touch torture. The new variables in each metric and the findings provided additional information to explore those correlations. The additional knowledge could reduce or eliminate the stigma of a targeted individual's mental health in the future. In terms of trauma, Morgan (2009) further described how the sufferers resorted to destructive addictions as a coping mechanism to adapt to the situation. The rising topic of addiction and trauma shared a cycle of co-occurring frequencies and the added effect of no-touch torture that prevented standard treatments. The sense of loss in these tragic events may foster a "dark power" (p.7) and increased the need for deeper resources within the traumatized. These concepts pointed out why some tortured individuals turned to alcohol or substance abuse and expressed displaced aggression to perceived or deliberate threats.

### **Limitations**

The 181-sample size displayed a striking difference from the 821,000,000 Google hits on the term targeted individual. An ideal sample would have included all races, locations, occupations, and ages to increase generalizability worldwide. Limitations excluded asset stripping/intellectual property theft, family relationships, perpetrator headcount, landscape/property damage, animal cruelty, medical, criminal or employment history. The study could use qualitative case studies to enhance the legitimacy of the experiences.

### **Similarities and Differences**

The research of Lustig et al. (2021) on haunted people syndrome or psychogenic illness, Lang et al. (2020) on novel persecutory belief syndrome, and Xuan and MacDonald (2019) psychotic, schizophrenic symptoms were inconsistent with the latest results. None of the studies factored possible bioeffects of no-touch torture as compiled in the current questionnaire as they focused on mental health. The similar conclusions in the survey were consistent with Sheridan and James (2015), Sheridan et al. (2020), Sarteschi (2018), Russell (2017), Kira et al. (2013, 2017), Houck and Repke (2017), Sales et al. (2021), Eichensehr (2021, and Bandura and Carpenter (2018) that targeting/no-touch torture by organized groups was possible using a dimensional perspective. The McAmis et al. (2022) analysis confirmed those in the healthcare industry who lacked awareness on human trafficking and introduce possible connections to the study.

A published scholarly article presented details (Jaiswal, 2022) on mind control technology and psychotronic weapons with some differences from the current evaluation. Out of 296 male and female responses, 71.29% completed a college degree, age 31-40 (29.39%), the torture year began between 1970 through 2008 was 1981-1990 (13.51%), age, when they became aware of the torture, was 21-30 (31.08%). Individuals discussed the ailments of toothaches, red eyes, headaches, direct pain, or occasional rudeness from a stranger (gangstalking/organized stalking) with continued bad luck. These technological advancements implied a person's nervous system, subconscious, and conscious mind was hackable to cause trauma. The statistics gave rise to the reality of targeting/no-touch torture in Jaiswal's article.

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

27

It depicted an application called the New World Order (NWO) Tortureware 6.66 (recently upgraded) that showcased different commands against the person's free will (Jaiswal, 2022). The mind commands used were these: emotion clone, voice to skull, memory kill, idea kill, idea program, hologram image, view through eyes, listen through ears, read thoughts, force speech, and force hate. The body commands were as followed: electric shock, power itch, limb move, collapse, fatigue, force sleep, force wake, sickness, high heat, fast pulse, and orgasm.

The software advertised online demonstrated the misuse of brain-computer interface and artificial intelligence applications designed to disrupt or manipulate people and outcomes en masse while under global surveillance. Even Perez-Sales (2022) referenced lethal and non-lethal weapons, media and internet usage, and artificial intelligence (AI) as a link to contemporary torture in his publication. The chief concern was knowing AI's capacity to be sentient. Some remote technological manipulations could cause interference with elections, employment, sporting events, stock exchange, decision making, pregnancies, active shootings/mass murder, human trafficking, addictions, community/domestic violence, climate issues, and prevent investigations or convictions.

One such no-touch torture case described Mr. James Walbert, nonconsensually chipped and implanted, who reported electronic assaults by his ex-business partner after a business disagreement. Mr. Walbert sued the police department (*Walbert v. Wichita Police Department*, 2011) because they failed to enforce a 2008 order of protection he previously proved in court. The Wichita Police Department may be interested in learning more about targeted individuals and gangstalking as more trauma victims come forward with similar scenarios, especially if they were at risk themselves.

### **Remedies**

Several remedies might resolve the stigma and disparate treatment of the victims and increase public education on remote technologies/operations because anyone can be targeted. As background, the American Psychiatric Association Diagnostic Statistical Manual (DSM) evolved from collecting a census with psychiatric hospitals and the U.S. Army manual in the 1950s to consolidate common psychological behaviors (Gorwitz, 1974). The DSM, its subsequent versions, and the International Classification of Diseases (maintained by the World Health Organization) left out bioeffects of military-grade weapons systems and technologies in their studies throughout the decades. A historical and current record analysis may reconcile the knowledge deficit between technology and trauma-related injuries.

A primary goal would be to build up victim-centric services, alliances, outreach programs, workshops, presentations, demonstrations, and speaking engagements to advocate no-touch torture awareness. These also include psychological and physical therapy and provide subject matter expert referrals to build cases. The practitioners could gain proficiencies in cognitive, biological, chemical, and electronic warfare, information operations, and esoteric science as it applied to trauma and gain cultural competency. Finally, collaborate with experts to conduct peer-reviewed scholarly research supporting targeted individuals as victims of terrorism, torture, and human trafficking would be a start.

### **Conclusions**

The current study gave insight into trauma victims and shared many familiar issues involving no-touch torture. The more evidence on the issue the better ways to support the person who suffered from it. The analysis examined connections of previous research, the infinite

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

29

applications of no-touch torture and its environment used by organized groups, findings, solutions, and conclusion. As new trends emerge on this ongoing issue the more prepared the practitioners will be. The overall study addressed common complaints of no-touch torture by a global population and required additional research to address these unique activities.

### References

- American Civil Liberties Union (2022). Spy files: The ACLU campaign to expose and stop illegal domestic spying. <https://www.aclu.org/issues/national-security/privacy-and-surveillance/spy-files>
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. (5th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Bandura, P., Carpenter, D. (2018). Planetary electromagnetic pollution: it is time to assess its impact. *The Lancet Planetary Health*, 2(12), 12 512-514.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196\(18\)30221-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(18)30221-3)
- Cellular Phone Task Force. (2023). Radio wave sickness: History.  
<https://cellphonetaskforce.org/radio-wave-sickness-history-and-scientific-review>
- Eichensehr, K. (2021). Investigations continue into mysterious illness affecting U.S. officials Havana and elsewhere. (2021). *The American Journal of International Law*, 115(3), 527-535. doi:10.1017/ajil.2021.27
- Gorwitz, K. (1974). Census enumeration of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded in the nineteenth century. *Health Services Reports*, 89(2), 180–187.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/4595007>
- Houck, S. C., & Repke, M. A. (2017). When and why we torture: A review of psychology research. *Translational Issues in Psychological Science*, 3(3), 272–283.  
doi:10.1037/tps0000120
- Jaiswal, T. (2022). Targeted individuals (TIs) and electronic harassment. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science & Engineering Technology (IJRASET)*, 10(5), 625-698.

doi: 10.22214/ijraset.2022.42280

Kira, I. A. (2017). A critical outlook at torture definition, structure, dynamics, and interventions.

*Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 23(3), 328–333.

doi:10.1037/pac0000243

Kira, I. A., Ashby, J. S., Odenat, L., & Lewandowsky, L. (2013). The mental health effects of torture trauma and its severity: A replication and extension. *Psychology*, 4(05), 472.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/psych.2013.45067>

Lange, R., Houran, J., Sheridan, L., Dagnall, N., Drinkwater, K., O’Keeffe, C., & Laythe, B.

(2020). Haunted people syndrome revisited: Empirical parallels between subjective paranormal episodes and group-stalking accounts. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*

23(7), 532–549. doi:10.1080/13674676.2020.1767552

Lustig, A., Brookes, G., & Hunt, D. (2021). Social semiotics of gangstalking evidence videos on

YouTube: Multimodal discourse analysis of a novel persecutory belief system. *JMIR*

*Mental Health*, 8(10). doi:10.2196/30311

Miller, L.A., & Lovler, R.L. (2020). *Foundations of psychological testing: A practical approach* (6th ed.). Sage.

McAmis, N. E., Mirabella, A. C., McCarthy, E. M., Cama, C. A., Fogarasi, M. C., Thomas, L.

A., Feinn, R. S., & Rivera-Godreau, I. (2022). Assessing healthcare provider knowledge of human trafficking. *PLoS One*, 17(3), e0264338. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0264338

Pérez-Sales P. (2022). The future is here: Mind control and torture in the digital era. *Torture*.

*Quarterly Journal on Rehabilitation of Torture Victims and Prevention of Torture*,

32(1,2), 280–290. doi:10.7146/torture.v32i1-2.132846

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

32

- Russell, N. (2017). An important milgram-holocaust linkage: Formal rationality. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 42(3), 261–292. doi:10.29173/cjs28291
- Sales, P., Rubio, R., Mellor-Marsa, B., Martines-Ales, G. (2021). Beyond torture checklists: an exploratory study of the reliability and construct validity of the Torturing Environment Scale (TES). *BMC Public Health*. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-10384-w
- Sarteschi, C. M. (2018). Mass murder, targeted individuals, and gang-stalking: Exploring the connection. *Violence and Gender*, 5(1), 45–54. doi:10.1089/vio.2017.0022
- Sheridan, L., James, D. V., & Roth, J. (2020). The phenomenology of group stalking ('gang-stalking'): A content analysis of subjective experiences. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(7). doi:10.3390/ijerph17072506
- Sheridan, L. P., & James, D. V. (2015). Complaints of group-stalking ('gang-stalking'): An exploratory study of their nature and impact on complainants. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 26(5), 601–623. doi:10.3390/ijerph17072506
- Xuan, L., & MacDonald, A. (2019). T120. Examining psychosis in social media: The targeted individuals movement and the potential of pathological echo-chambers. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 45, S250–S251. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbz019.400
- Walbert v. Wichita Police Department*, CIVIL ACTION No. 10-1234-MLB (D. Kan. Jun. 21, 2011) <https://casetext.com/case/walbert-v-wichita-police-department>
- World Health Organization (2022). International Classification of Diseases 11th Revision (ICD-11): [icd.who.int/en](http://icd.who.int/en)
- United Nations Human Rights Council. (2020). Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment punishment. Report of the Special Rapporteur. <https://documents-dds->



TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

33

[ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G20/070/73/PDF/G2007073.pdf?OpenElement](http://ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G20/070/73/PDF/G2007073.pdf?OpenElement)

## Appendix A

### IRB Letter of Approval



---

**Expedited Review—Final Approval**

October 12, 2022

Ms. Joy Womac  
Purdue University Global  
[jowomac@student.purdueglobal.edu](mailto:jowomac@student.purdueglobal.edu)

Re: → Protocol #22-71 — “Marked as Dangerous: An Investigative Analysis of No-Touch Torture Methods on Targeted Individuals.”

Dear Ms. Womac:

Your proposed project was reviewed by the Purdue University Global Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects under an Expedited Category. It was determined that your project activity meets the expedited criteria as defined by the DHHS Regulations for the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46), and is in compliance with this institution’s Federal Wide Assurance 00010058.

Please notify the IRB immediately of any proposed changes that may affect the expedited status of your project. You should report any unanticipated problems involving risks to human subjects or others to the IRB.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact feel free to contact me at [spettine@purdueglobal.edu](mailto:spettine@purdueglobal.edu). I wish you well with your project!

Sincerely,

**Susan B. Pettine**

Susan B. Pettine, Ph.D., CBM  
IRB Chair  
Purdue University Global

cc: → Dr. Gabrielle Blackman

TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

35

**Appendix B**

Correspondence redacted for privacy reasons

## Appendix C

### Research Announcement

My name is Joyeux “Joy” Womac.

I am conducting research through Purdue University Global to obtain a Master’s Degree in Psychology.

The purpose of the research is to determine if a targeted individual suffers trauma from no-touch torture.

A targeted individual is usually defined as three or more people who destroy a person’s life by no-touch torture such as gangstalking by organized groups. Other methods are voice-to-skull (V2K) technology, subliminal messaging, cyber torture, cybernetics, biological or chemical, electronic harassment (torture), brain computer interface, remote neural monitoring, hydrogel sensors, implants, or chips. To be eligible the person is between the ages of 18 and 99 that has experienced no-touch torture. The term targeted individual has no official definition but is described as three or more people who destroy one’s life by no-touch torture through organized groups.

If you are interested in being part of this study, I will send a survey link:  
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/JKKCP8N> for you to fill out.

This study will be anonymous, so no one will know that you were a participant, and no one will ever be able to connect your answers to your identity.

## Appendix D

### Informed Consent

#### Purdue University Global Consent for Participation in Research

### **Marked as Dangerous: An Investigative Analysis of No Touch Torture Methods on Targeted Individuals**

#### **CONCISE SUMMARY**

This research is to determine common complaints of targeted individuals and if they suffer trauma from no touch torture. It will involve your experiences, physical or psychological damage and any other issues associated with no touch torture. A targeted individual is defined as three or more people who destroy one's life by organized through various means. Gangstalking is an example of a common tactic.

The purpose of the study is to determine not only common complaints of targeted individuals but if they suffer from no touch torture. The duration is as long as the subject feels comfortable answering the questions, approximately up to 10 minutes. This may induce trauma for discussing these issues. The only requirement is to answer the questions to the best of your knowledge and experience. The benefit is that it may expose, educate, and empower those who are victims of these alleged crimes and get support. The information presented in this section is discussed in greater detail later in the consent form.

#### **Why am I being asked?**

You are being asked to be a participant in a research study to determine common complaints and about whether or not targeted individuals suffer trauma from no touch torture. This research study is being conducted by Joyeux Womac, a Master's of Science in Psychology student at Purdue University Global. You have been asked to participate in the research because you self-identified as a targeted individual subjected to no-touch torture by organized groups of at least three or more people and may be eligible to participate. Some common no-touch torture methods include gangstalking/organized stalking/group stalking, directed energy weapons, voice-to-skull technology, and biological/chemical attacks. As a result, you may experience several effects that

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

38

cause trauma to you. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the research.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Purdue University Global or any other cooperating institutions as well. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting that relationship.

### **What is the purpose of this research?**

This research aims to determine common complaints of targeted individuals and if they suffer trauma from no touch torture.

### **What procedures are involved?**

If you agree to be in this research, we would ask you to do the following things: Answer the questions to the best of your ability and take breaks as necessary.

At least 100 participants may be involved in this research at Purdue University Global.

### **What are the potential risks and discomforts?**

The research may induce triggers from previous trauma associated with your experiences. Although it is unlikely, should participants experience any emotional discomfort resulting from completing the survey, they can contact the Emotional Distress Hotline, a national mental health hotline, available 24/7 for free at 1-800-LIFENET.

### **Are there benefits to taking part in the research?**

This research may expose, educate, and empower those who are victims of no touch torture to come forward and raise awareness of these alleged crimes or activity. Payment for participation is not, in and of itself, a direct benefit of the research.

### **What about privacy and confidentiality?**

No one will know that you are a research subject because this research is totally anonymous. No information about you or provided by you during the research can ever be disclosed to others because no information that can identify you as an individual will be collected. When the research results are published or discussed at conferences, no information will be included that could ever reveal your identity.

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

39

Any information obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law.

Personal information, research data, and related records will be stored on the researcher's personal laptop to prevent access by unauthorized personnel.

The research data will be stored by the researcher on a secure laptop and a secure external hard drive.

Specific consent will be solicited if other uses are contemplated contingent on the individual responses to the survey questionnaires will be destroyed following analyses of the data. The individual responses to survey questionnaires will be destroyed after five years following data analyses.

At this time, no reimbursement is available for participation in this research. There will be no payment or gifts for this study.

### **Can I withdraw from the study?**

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study.

### **Whom should I contact if I have questions?**

The researcher conducting this study is Joyeux Womac. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact the researchers at: Email: [jnw305@gmail.com](mailto:jnw305@gmail.com). You may also contact the researcher's thesis adviser, Dr. Gabrielle Blackman PhD, at [gblackman@purdueglobal.edu](mailto:gblackman@purdueglobal.edu).

### **What are my rights as a research subject?**

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Purdue University Global through the following representative:

Susan Pettine, IRB Chair

Email: [spettine@purdueglobal.edu](mailto:spettine@purdueglobal.edu)

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

40

Remember: Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Purdue University Global or any other cooperating institutions as well. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting that relationship. If you agree to complete the consent form online, click “agree” to consent to participate.

You may keep a copy of this form for your information and your records.

### **Signature of Subject**

I have read (or someone has read to me) the above information. I have been given an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research. I have been given a copy of this form.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Joy Womac

Signature of Researcher

Date (must be same as subject's)



08/30/2022



## Appendix E

Table 1.

Survey Development Plan (based on Miller &amp; Lovler, 2015):

Objective	Operational Definition	Number and Type of Items
To assess common demographics that organized groups target	Current age, ethnicity/race, occupation, political view, relationship status, religion, education level, year/age when targeted/no-touch torture began, etc. to determine what factors organized groups use to target others.	I will measure this objective using five Likert scale items. These items comprise Q1 – Q12 of my survey.
To assess common methods of no-touch torture	I define the common methods of no-touch torture as: gangstalking/organized stalking/group stalking usually three (it can be two) or more who organize to destroy a person's life by defamation/slander, following, property damage, harassing, stalking, noise campaign, workplace sabotage, color harassment, street theater, and any behavior or action that can be one at a time relay-style or as a collective to create deliberate, negative experiences and/or sensitize another. Other methods are military grade non-lethal weapons, voice to skull (V2K) technology, cyber or electronic torture (harassment), psychotronic, biological, or chemical.	I will measure this objective using five Likert scale items. These items comprise Q13-Q15
To assess common bodily damage (extrinsic trauma) by no-touch torture	I define common bodily damage by no-touch torture as: diminished eyesight, hearing, thought processes, constant red or bloodshot eyes, low levels of glucose, salts, hydration, and low red blood cell count. Requires common observation and basic testing/measurements.	I will measure this objective using five Likert scale items. These items comprise Q16-Q19
To assess common biological and psychological damage (intrinsic trauma) from no-touch torture	I define common biological and psychological conditions: Symptoms of active traumatic stress like Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, depression, Havana Syndrome, and Morgellons disease. Requires specialized testing and observation.	I will measure this objective using five Likert scale items. This item will comprise of Q20-Q23
To assess common alcohol and substance abuse to mitigate trauma (harm) from no-touch torture	I define common alcohol, substance, and prescription abuse as a patterned use in which the user consumes amounts of substances or methods which are harmful to themselves or others.	I will measure this objective using five Likert scale items. This item will comprise of Q24
To assess motive of no-touch torture	I define motive as any common action to harm another such as entertainment,	I will measure this objective by an open-ended question with multiple

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

42

	experimentation/testing, fear, free thinker, gratification, hatred, power and control, profit, revenge, status/initiation, theft of intellectual property, or whistleblowing.	choice. This item will comprise of Q25
To assess organized groups that benefit	I define this as any organized group that engages in alleged crimes associated with gangstalking and/or military grade weapons systems, (like nonlethal and/or voice to skull V2K technology), or other advanced capabilities, human trafficking, mass murder, and other crimes.	I will measure this using five Likert scale items. This item will comprise of Q26-Q29
To assess the torture environment	I define this as any inside or outside construct designed to inflict trauma (harm) with cumulative effect or a combination of techniques on the basic human functions to break one's will. Examples are experiences of sadistic ritual abuse, cruel, inhuman, and/or degrading treatment. Others surrounding the target seem subjected to the same treatment or experiences.	I will measure this using five Likert scale items. This item will comprise of Q30-Q31

## Appendix F

### Targeted Individuals (No Touch Torture Survey)

**Measure 1.** Assess common demographics that organized groups target

\* 1. In what state or U.S. territory do you live?

Alabama, Alaska, American Samoa, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia (DC), Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Northern Marianas Islands, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Virgin Islands, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Prefer not to answer, Other (please specify)

\* 2. In what country do you live?

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Berlin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, British Virgin Island, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cayman Islands, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte D'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial, Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Montserrat, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

44

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Turks and Caicos, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Prefer not to answer, Other (please specify)

\* 3. What is your age bracket?

18 to 24, 25 to 34, 35 to 44, 45 to 54, 55 to 64, 65 to 74, 75 or older, Prefer not to answer  
Other (please specify)

\* 4. What is your ethnicity?

White or Caucasian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander  
Multiple ethnicity/Other, Prefer not to answer, Other (please specify)

\* 5. What is your relationship status?

Single, In a relationship (Not Married), Separated, Married, Widowed, Prefer Not to Answer,  
Other (please specify)

\* 6. In general, how would you describe your views on most political issues? Are you:

Very conservative, Conservative, Moderate, Liberal, Very liberal, Not political, Prefer not to answer, Other (please specify)

\* 7. What is your gender identity?

Woman, Man, Genderqueer or non-binary, Agender, Prefer not to answer, Not specified above,  
please specify, None of the above

\* 8. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Less than a high school degree, High school degree or equivalent (GED), Some college but no degree, Associate degree, Bachelor degree, Masters degree, Doctoral, Other (please specify),  
None of the above, Prefer not to answer

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

45

\*9. Which occupation best fits you? Any level of government (including former, retired), Any level of military (including former, retired), Any level of military or government civilian contractor (including former or retired), Private sector that is non-military or non-government blue collar (including former or retired), Private sector that is non-military or non-government white collar (including former, retired, self-employed), Prefer not to answer, Other (please specify), None of the above

\*10. What year did the no-touch torture began? 1930 through 2022, Prefer not to answer, Other (please specify), None of the above

\*11. How old were you when the no-touch torture began? Under 18, 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+, Prefer not to answer, Other (please specify)

\* 12. How long has the no-touch torture occurred?

Less than a year, 1-5 years, 5-10 years, more than 10 years, Prefer not to answer, Other (please specify)

**Measure 2.** To assess common methods of no-touch torture

Likert Scale 0-5, 0 none at all and 5 the most

\*13. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most often, To what extent is it likely you have physical or psychological trauma by gang stalking/organized stalking usually by three or more people that create deliberate, negative experiences, and/or sensitize you in a repeated manner? Examples are defamation/slander, damage to property, following, harassing, or stalking.

\* 14. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most often, To what extent is it likely you have physical and psychological trauma by military-grade non-lethal weapons like directed energy weapons, and voice-to-skull V2K technology (including silent V2K), or subliminal messaging? Examples are automated messaging (in head), unexplained blood clots (even synthetic), bruises, burns, fatigue, heat sensations, laser marks, traumatic brain injury (no concussion) or unconventional acquired brain injury (UBI), voices in head, or weakness.

\* 15. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most often, On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

46

none at all and 5 the most often, To what extent is it likely you have physical and psychological trauma by cyber or electronic torture (harassment), or psychotronic torture, cybernetics, biological or chemical, and/or electronic harassment (torture)?

Examples are artificial intelligence, bill monitoring, biological attacks, body manipulation, brain-computer interface chemical attacks, chills, chips, dream intrusion, EEG heterodyning cloning (hive mind), hacking, hydrogel sensors, identity theft, implants, intrusive thoughts, itching, jabbing, jerking, laser marks, noticeable burns, remote neural monitoring, spasms, zapping

**Measure 3.** To assess common bodily damage (extrinsic trauma) by no-touch torture

\* 16. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely you have diminished eyesight, hearing, and/or thought processes because of the no-touch torture?

\* 17. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely your eyes are often red or bloodshot from no-touch torture?

\* 18. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely you have low salt or low glucose (sugar) levels, and/or constantly dehydrated because of the no-touch torture?

\* 19. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely you have diminished red blood cell count because of the no-touch torture?

**Measure 4.** To assess common biological and psychological (intrinsic trauma) effects from no-touch torture

\* 20. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent do you think you have symptoms of Havana Syndrome? Common issues are intense nausea, headaches, pressure, dizziness, tinnitus, trouble thinking, traumatic brain injury (no concussion), vision problems, and pain in one or both ears.

\* 21. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent do you think you have symptoms of Morgellons's Disease due to the no-touch torture? Common issues are brain fog, fatigue, other neurological symptoms, itching with tiny fibers protruding from the skin, or lesions.

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

47

\* 22. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely you have symptoms of Depression with prolonged series of traumatic experiences based on the no-touch torture?

\* 23. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely you have symptoms of active trauma as seen in Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) with prolonged series of traumatic experiences based on the no-touch torture?

**Measure 5.** To assess common alcohol and substance abuse to mitigate trauma (harm) from no-touch torture

\* 24. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely you increased at least one substance such as alcohol, marijuana, hard drugs, and/or prescription drugs because of the no-touch torture?

**Measure 6.** To assess the motive for no-touch torture

\*25. What was the primary motive for others to begin no-touch torture on you? Check all that apply. Discrimination, Entertainment, Experimentation/testing, Fear, Free thinker/Nonconformist, Gratification, Hidden agenda, Hatred, Helping another targeted individual, Ideology (social, spiritual, sexual orientation, or political), Jealousy, Misperception, Power and control (rule of man versus rule of law), Prefer not to answer, Profit, Revenge, Self-advancement, Silencing, Status/Initiation, Theft of intellectual property, Whistleblowing activity

**Measure 7.** To assess organized groups that benefit

\*26. What organized groups do you think are involved? Check all that apply Churches, Collaboration between diverse agencies, Community, Co-workers, Cults (Secret societies), Friends and family, Fusion centers, Government, Intelligence and law enforcement, Military, Neighborhood watch, Prefer not to answer, Private companies, Very wealthy individual(s), Other (please specify), None of the above

\*27. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely you think there are more alleged crimes associated with the no-touch torture than you initially think?

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

48

\*28 a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely you think there are ties to human trafficking with the no-touch torture?

\*29. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely there are ties to the mass murders or active shootings and no-touch torture by these organized groups?

**Measure 8.** To assess the torture environment

\*30. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely you feel you are in a torture/targeting program? Examples are experiences of sadistic ritual abuse, cruel, inhuman, and/or degrading treatment

\*31. On a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 none at all and 5 the most. To what extent is it likely that you feel others surrounding you are targeted as well?



## Appendix G

**Table 2.**

*Respondents' Assess Common Demographic Characteristics That Organized Groups Target (N=184)*

Measure	All Subjects
Geographic Location in United States and Territories	
Alabama	1.6%
Alaska	.5%
Arizona	5.4%
Arkansas	1.1%
California	13.2%
Colorado	1.6%
District of Columbia (DC)	.5%
Florida	2.2%
Georgia	1.1%
Idaho	.5%
Illinois	3.3%
Indiana	1.1%
Iowa	.5%
Kentucky	.5%
Louisiana	.5%
Maryland	2.2%
Massachusetts	1.6%
Michigan	2.7%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

50

Minnesota	1.1%
Mississippi	1.6%
Missouri	3.3%
Nebraska	.5%
Nevada	1.6%
New Hampshire	.5%
New Jersey	1.6%
New Mexico	.5%
New York	3.8%
North Carolina	1.6%
Ohio	2.2%
Oklahoma	.5%
Oregon	2.7%
Pennsylvania	4.4%
South Carolina	.5%
Tennessee	3.8%
Texas	5.4%
Utah	.5%
Vermont	.5%
Virginia	.5%
Washington	3.3%
Prefer not to say	2.2%
Other (please specify) (Other countries)	15.9%

---

Geographic Location Outside United States

---

# TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

51

Australia	2.2%
Belgium	1.1%
Canada	2.7%
China	1.1%
Colombia	.5%
Croatia	.5%
France	.5%
Germany	.5%
Italy	.5%
New Zealand	1.1%
Norway	.5%
Portugal	.5%
Spain	.5%
Switzerland	.5%
Thailand	.5%
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4.3%
United States of America	82.1%
Prefer not to answer	0%
Other (please specify)	0%
<b>Age</b>	
18 to 24	1.6%
25 to 34	8.2%
35 to 44	22.8%
45 to 54	28.8%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

52

55 to 64	25%
65 to 74	12%
75 or older	1.5%
None of the above	0.0%
Prefer not to answer	0.0%
<hr/>	
Race	
<hr/>	
White or Caucasian	67.9%
Black or African American	12.5%
Hispanic or Latino	4.9%
Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander	4.3%
Multiple ethnicity/Other (please specify combined)	8.69%
Prefer not to answer	1.6%
None of the above	0
<hr/>	
Race (Other please specify) (Breakdown below)	
<hr/>	
Arab descent	.5%
Arabian, Spaniard, Puerto Rican, Indonesian	.5%
German Canadian	.5%
Half Caucasian, half Hispanic.	.5%
Māori and English	.5%
Middle eastern	.5%
Spanish, German, Italian American born	.5%
Two or more races otherwise black.	.5%
Unknown (race) because of MKULTRA breeding program	.5%
<hr/>	
Relationship status	
<hr/>	

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

53

Divorced	19%
In a relationship (Not Married)	9.2%
Married	14.1%
Separated	3.8%
Single	46.7%
Widowed	5.4%
Prefer not to Answer	.5%
None of the above	0
Other (please specify)	.5%
<b>Relationship status (Other please specify) (Break down)</b>	
Due to targeting separated from loved one	.5%
<b>Political views</b>	
Very conservative	2.2%
Conservative	15.2%
Moderate	20.7%
Liberal	16.8%
Very liberal	4.9%
Not political	25.0%
Prefer not to answer	8.7%
Other (please specify) (No breakdown)	7.1%
<b>Gender</b>	
Woman	55.5%
Man	43.4%
Genderqueer or non-binary	1.1%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

54

Prefer not to answer	0.0%
None of the above	0.0%
Other (please specify)	0.0%
<hr/>	
Education	
<hr/>	
Less than a high school degree	5.5%
High school degree or equivalent (GED)	17.6%
Some college, but no degree	30.2%
Associate degree	11.5%
Bachelor's degree	16.5%
Master's degree	11.0%
Doctoral/ Postdoctoral degree	3.3%
Prefer not to answer	0.0%
None of the above	1.1%
Other	.54%
<hr/>	
Education (Other please specify) (Break down)	
<hr/>	
Graduate (unspecified)	.5%
<hr/>	
Occupation	
<hr/>	
Any level of government (including former, retired)	5.4%
Any level of the military (including former, retired)	1.6%
Any level of the military or government civilian contractor (including former, retired)	3.3%
Disabled	6.0%
Private sector that is non-military or non-government blue collar (including former, retired, self-employed)	17.4%
Private sector that is non-military or non-government white collar (including former, retired, self-employed)	16.8%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

55

Retired	4.9%
Unemployed	23.9%
Prefer not to answer	9.2%
None of the above	2.72%
Other (please specify)	8.70%
<b>Occupation (Other please specify) (Break down)</b>	
Former law firm employee, professional photographer in training (Truncated)	.5%
Addiction counselor	.5%
Clergy	.5%
Federally qualified health center (not-for-profit)	.5%
Former business owner (Grocery Market)	.5%
Health care	.5%
Homemaker	.5%
Former Hawaiian Tropic swimsuit model and aesthetician (Truncated)	.5%
Legislative branch government and small business owner	.5%
Logistics	1.1%
Nurse	.5%
S saw worker	.5%
Sales	.5%
Self-employed limited income	.5%
Social work field	.5%
Waitress/cleaner	.5%
<b>Year no-touch torture began</b>	

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

56

---

1964	.5%
1966	.5%
1968	.5%
1971	.5%
1974	1.1%
1975	.5%
1978	.5%
1980	.5%
1981	.5%
1983	.5%
1993	1.6%
1994	1.1%
1995	1.1%
1998	.5%
1999	1.6%
2000	.5%
2001	1.1%
2002	1.6%
2003	3.3%
2004	2.7%
2005	.5%
2006	2.2%
2007	1.1%



## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

57

2008	2.2%
2009	.5%
2010	3.8%
2011	3.3%
2012	6.5%
2013	3.3%
2014	2.2%
2015	5.4%
2016	7.1%
2017	3.3%
2018	6.5%
2019	9.8%
2020	11.4%
2021	5.4%
2022	2.2%
Prefer not to answer	1.1%
Unsure	.5%
None of the above	1.6%

---

### Length of time no-touch torture occurred

---

Less than a year	4.9%
1-5 years	31.5%
5-10 years	20.7%
More than 10 years	38.0%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

58

More than 20 years	2.7%
Not sure/unsure	.5%
Prefer to not to answer	.5%
<hr/>	
Length of time no-touch torture occurred (Other please specify) (Break down)	
<hr/>	
Off and on for decades	.5%
Since early childhood covertly, but the extreme and overt torture for 7 years	.5%

**Table 3.**

*Respondents assess common methods of no-touch torture, bodily damage (extrinsic trauma), biological and physical (intrinsic trauma), alcohol and substance abuse to mitigate (trauma) using Likert Scale ranges from “0” none at all = to “5” most. (N=184)*

Subscales	Mean	Std Deviation
<hr/>		
No-touch torture method		
Gangstalking/organized stalking	4.3043	1.33256
Non-lethal military grade weapons systems (Directed Energy Weapons/Voice to Skull)	4.1793	1.61123
Cyber/electronic/cybernetic/biological/chemical	4.5054	1.11128
<hr/>		
Bodily physical damage (extrinsic trauma)		
<hr/>		
Diminished eyesight, hearing, thought processes	4.1141	1.31947
Red/bloodshot eyes	3.2717	1.52647
Low salt, glucose levels/dehydrated constantly	3.5326	1.50374
Feel diminished red blood cell count	3.1250	1.55786
<hr/>		
Biological and psychological damage (intrinsic trauma)		
<hr/>		
Havana syndrome symptoms	4.1250	1.31016
Morgellons disease symptoms	3.0000	1.68568

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

59

Depression symptoms	3.9620	1.44618
Active trauma symptoms similar to PTSD	4.1685	1.30944
<hr/>		
Alcohol and substance abuse		
<hr/>		
Used at least one substance to mitigate trauma	3.1630	1.86880

**Table 4.**

*Respondents assess common motive of no-touch torture (N=184).*

Measure	All Subjects
Motive	
Discrimination	33.5%
Entertainment	38.5%
Experimentation/testing	57.7%
Fear	25.3%
Free thinker/nonconformist	56.6%
Gratification	24.7%
Hidden agenda	39.0%
Hatred	43.4%
Helping another targeted individual	8.8%
Ideology (social, spiritual, sexual orientation, or political)	36.8%
Jealousy	33.55
Misperception	22.5%
Power and control (rule of man versus rule of law)	53.8%
Revenge	45.1%
Self-advancement	20.9%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

60

Silencing	39.6%
Spiritual warfare	35.7%
Status/Initiation	11.0%
Theft of intellectual property	22.0%
Whistleblowing activity	29.1%
Don't know/want to know	3.8%
Genocide/democide	1.1%
None of the above	1.6%
Prefer not to answer	1.6 %
Other	16.30%
<hr/>	
Motive (Other please specify) (Break down)	
<hr/>	
Homeless, drug addict	.5%
Former husband put me in covert narcissist payback (Name redacted for privacy)	.5%
Naturally Born Dual Citizenship, Researching DEWs, Deep Biblical understanding, Musical Talent (a money maker for the mafia) Outspoken, Military Background (personal or familial), Scientific, Medical, Psychiatric, Network architecture, Computer background, Decriminalizing any illegal drug, Communes that overproduce, Being related to anyone targeted. (Truncated)	.5%
A case with the FBI	.5%
Anti-war activism, and I angered the CIA neighbor who lived next door and worked with my dad.	.5%
Asset stripping, theft, annihilate competition	.5%
Behavior modification	.5%
Commit election fraud overseas and United States	.5%
Complex involving injustice and cover up investigations by authorities (Truncated)	.5%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

61

Dominating another human being 'Playing god', making fun without the ability of exposing their bullying. Psychopathic sadistic perpetrators (covert)	.5%
Evil	.5%
Exploitation via dark web contests or wagering	.5%
Exposing government corruption and supporter of President Trump	.5%
Face to face sex trafficking and other trafficking	.5%
Family related	.5%
I think it's sexual. Rape is they're main theme	.5%
I was recruited by CIA, turned them down, attacks began on a vicious level after that, has not stopped, only gotten worse	.5%
I was seen as an opportunity for testing addictions, reactions, training, to abuse, conditioning, experiment on how much they can change me and my life, see what will work and not work, to degrade another person, to practice all their attacks on and force a lot of suffering	.5%
Spiritual war, switched at birth, I am being surprised by something, City of Hickory, North Carolina where I live hides a very nasty secret (Truncated)	.5%
Medical mistake, and I didn't even start a lawsuit	.5%
Mining brain data/ biohacking	.5%
My brother's greed	.5%
Obstruction of justice, stop my human rights, national security, war crimes investigations.	.5%

**Table 5.**

*Respondents' assess common organized groups that benefit (N=184).*

Measure	All Subjects
Organized groups	
Churches	33.2%
Collaboration between diverse agencies	48.9%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

62

Community	56%
Co-workers/former co-workers	26.6%
Cults (Secret societies)	54.3%
Friends and family	34.8%
Fusion centers	44.6%
Government/foreign government/corrupt officials	65.8%
Intelligence and law enforcement	71.2%
Military	58.7%
Neighbor(s)/neighborhood watch	48.4%
Private companies	48.9%
Very wealthy individual(s)	43.5%
Don't know/want to know	1.1%
Criminal organizations, human traffickers, terrorists, gangs, motorcycle gangs	3.8%
Landlords/firms	1.6%
Prefer not to answer	3.3%
Other (please specify)	13.04%
<b>Organized groups (Other please specify) (Break down)</b>	
Neo-Nazi agency (nation & international socialists, eugenics), European cult (Château de Amerois), Biotech and Microchip firms (European: Pfizer, Moderna, Johnson & Johnson, Taiwanese, Bio firms, Several microchip manufacturing conglomerates for patent control of chip and biotech research monopoly for the foreseeable future Chinese Military and Mass manufacturing of cyber-spy hardware) World Health Organization, National Institutes of Health, Center for Disease Control, World Economic Forum, Military physiological tracking tech (Self-assembling graphene in petri dishes). Likely Russian agents as well, Interagency false intel and DEW, surveillance warfare is probable (Truncated)	.5%
Anyone with influential connections	.5%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

63

Big corporations, Amazon, Anthem so on	.5%
Cannabis Corporate interests	.5%
Church of Scientology, Hollywood, celebrities, Boeing, intelligence led policing, Democratic National Committee, other corrupt politicians, those who possess biological masers and military grade weapons systems with artificial intelligence manipulation, signals hacking, and brain computer interface	.5%
CIA	.5%
Doctor Offices, Dentists, Eye Doctors, Dermatologists, Labs, Hospitals	.5 %
Evil	.5%
God=Devil=Space Alien(s) and Big Tobacco.	.5%
Former boyfriend, his friend, and family	.5%
I whistle-blew on criminal politicians	.5%
InfraGard contracts stalkers, cyberstalkers and is in same building as FBI in Nashville, TN	.5%
It seems to be a group with access to possibly Govt Tech.	.5%
Lockheed Martin; law firm was paid to obtain a clearance	.5%
Masonic Jewish interests	.5%
Masons, Satanists	.5%
My husband	.5%
Patriots and White Supremacists	.5%
Possibly done by Russian relation to a former boyfriend	.5%
University of Pittsburgh Medical Center targeted me for whistleblowing	.5%
Unsure - James Giordano recently stated that there is evidence civilians are being targeted by hackers but could be anyone including AI developers	.5%
Was trafficked to billionaires and heads of state, whistle blew on Dow Corning, Monsanto, Big Pharma, US govt	.5%

## TARGETED INDIVIDUALS

64

World Economic Forum	.5%
Well known groups like the Bilderberg members and the Macy Foundation probably what was the prelude to the spawning of the whole program. Also, I think Universities are involved, Black Operations and so on	.5%

**Table 6.**

*Respondents' assess organized groups that benefit and torture environments using Likert Scale  
Likert Scale ranges from "0" none at all = to "5" most.*

Subscales	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>Organized groups that benefit</b>		
Alleged crimes associated with no-touch torture	4.3533	1.21924
Human trafficking associated with no-touch torture	4.0652	1.45087
Mass murder or active shooting associated with no-touch torture	4.4674	1.15424
<b>Torture environment</b>		
Think they are in a targeting/torture program	4.5707	1.03776
Think others surrounding them are targeted/tortured	3.5652	1.45463