

Remote Viewing

REMOTE VIEWING

**The Science and Theory of
Nonphysical Perception**

Courtney Brown

Atlanta
FARSIGHT PRESS

FARSIGHT PRESS

First published by Farsight Press, a member of Farsight, Inc.

First Printing, April, 2005 (Revised May, 2005 and again May 2006)

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

Copyright © Courtney Brown, 2005, 2006

All rights reserved

Scientific Remote Viewing®, SRV®, and Farsight® are internationally registered marks of Farsight, Inc.

PUBLISHER'S CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA:

(Provided by Quality Books, Inc.)

Brown, Courtney 1952-

Remote viewing: the science and theory of nonphysical perception /
Courtney Brown.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-9766762-0-6 (hard cover)

ISBN 0-9766762-1-4 (soft cover)

1. Remote viewing (Parapsychology). 2. Extrasensory perception.
3. Parapsychology and science. I. Title.

BF1389.R45B76 2005

133.8

QBI06-600243

Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise), without the prior written permission of both the copyright owner and the above publisher of this book.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Dedicated to
Michael Raoul Duval

Contents

List of Tables x

List of Figures xi

Preface xiii

The History of the Book Manuscript xi

Some Special People xiii

A Note of Caution Regarding the Media xiv

Where We Are Now xxvii

Chapter

1. The Open Mind 1

What is Remote Viewing? 2

Scientific Remote Viewing 4

Proof Versus Process 6

The Legitimacy of Doubt 7

The History of Remote Viewing 8

My Own Background in Remote Viewing 10

How to Place the Contribution of this Book 13

The Structure of This Research 16

2. A Theoretical Perspective of Scientific Remote Viewing 19

The Subspace Hypothesis 19

Overcoming the Low-bandwidth Limitation 26

The Remote-Viewing Process 31

Shifting the Awareness of the Physical/Subspace

Interface 35

Subspace “Thinking” 41

The Remote-Viewing Experience 42

“Closing” the Session 44

The Experimental Conditions 45

3. Cross-Cutting Psi Channels in Remote Viewing 51

Current Research Background 52

The Breakthrough 53

The New Experimental Design 56

	Results	61
	Session Clarity and the “Switched” Sessions	63
	A Theory of Focused Perception	71
	A Conceptual Model of Remote-Viewing Perception	74
	Appendix to Chapter 3	79
4.	The Question of Time: The Alpha Project	85
	The Alpha Experiment	95
	Project Limitations	97
	Results	98
	Conclusion	102
	Appendix to Chapter 4	107
5.	The Repeated Trial Problem: The Lottery Revisited	111
	Session Analysis Machine (SAM)	116
	The Target Pool and Straining the Sessions	117
	Collecting the Remote-Viewing Data	118
	Comparing the Remote-Viewing Data with the Target Data	119
	Testing SAM	120
	The Results of the Full Lottery Test	122
	What Makes a Target a Target?	128
	Appendix to Chapter 5	130
6.	A Public Demonstration of Scientific Remote Viewing	135
	The Design of the Demonstration Experiments	135
	Closing a Session Revisited	140
	The Criteria for the Targets	140
	Results	143
	The Objective Statistical Analysis	147
	Experiment #1: TWA Flight 800 crash/event	156
	Experiment #3: The assassination of Abraham Lincoln	157
	Experiment #4: The Battle of Gettysburg	158
	Experiment #6: The Eiffel Tower	159
	Experiment #7: The White House	160
	Experiment #8: The battle between the Bon Homme Richard and the HMS Serapis	163
	Experiment #9: Mount Everest	165
	Experiment #10: The Leaning Tower of Pisa	168
	Experiment #11: The USS Missouri	169
	Experiment #12: The Edge of the Polar Plateau	172
	Experiment #14: The eruption of Mt. Vesuvius	176
	Experiment #15: The Statue of Liberty	179
	Summary	181

Appendix I to Chapter 6	182
Appendix II to Chapter 6	185
Test #1: Basic Counts and a Chi-square Test	185
Interpretation of the Chi-square Statistic	186
Test #2: The Russell Procedure	187
Test #3: Correspondence and Correlation	189
Statistical Evaluations for Public Experiment #12	190
7. Modeling the Subspace Perceptual Focus	199
An Example with a Two-Target Attractor	203
Appendix to Chapter 7	211
8. Remote Viewing, Cosmology, and Quantum Mechanics	215
Experiential Cosmology	215
The Two-Slit Experiment	227
Entanglement	236
Pulling Things Together with a Simplified Heuristic Model	241
Planck's Wave	250
The Meaning of Determinism	259
Brown's Rule	261
World Lines, Relativity, and the Propagation of Events	262
9. A Theory of Mind	269
Subspace Psychology	271
Alternative Perspectives of the Human Subspace Aspect	275
Of Time and Free Will	279
The Human Condition	281
Appendix to Volume: How to Construct a Target for a Public Demonstration of Remote Viewing	285
Numbered Aspects	289
Glossary	293
References	299
Index	307

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Experimental Conditions for Research Presented in Chapters 3-6	49
Table 3.1: Farsight Base-10 to Binary Numerical Code	57
Table 3.2: Summary of Clarity Scores, “Switched” Sessions, and Undetermined Sessions	63
Table A3.1: The Target Set	79
Table A3.2a: Session Summary Scores for First-Ball Results	81
Table A3.2b: Session Summary Scores for Second-Ball Results	82
Table A3.2c: Session Summary Scores for Third-Ball Results	83
Table A3.2d: Session Summary Scores for Fourth-Ball Results	84
Table 4.1: Project Alpha Session Scores and Targeting Dates	99
Table 4.2: Summary Information	100
Table A4.1: Target Specifics for the Alpha Project	107
Table 5.1: SAM Straining Instrument Categories	130
Table 6.1: The Public Demonstration Session Scores	144
Table 6.2: The Public Demonstration Primary and Opposite Targets	148
Table 6.3: Objective Statistical Tests of the Public Demonstration Data, Viewer – Courtney	150
Table 6.4: Objective Statistical Tests of the Public Demonstration Data, Viewers – Joey and Matthew	153
Table A6.1: Targets Used for the Public Demonstration Experiments	182
Table 8.1: Dimensional Correspondence Between the Harmonic Oscillator Model and Physical Reality	253

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1: Viewer – R. Moore, Second Ball, Third Binary Digit	65
Figure 3.2: Viewer – R. Moore, Second Ball, Third Binary Digit	66
Figure 3.3: Viewer – J. Jerome, Second Ball, Third Binary Digit	67
Figure 3.4: Viewer – J. Jerome, Second Ball, Third Binary Digit	68
Figure 3.5: Viewer – R. Moore, Third Ball, Second Binary Digit	69
Figure 3.6: Viewer – R. Moore, Third Ball, Second Binary Digit	69
Figure 3.7: Viewer – J. Jerome, Third Ball, Second Binary Digit	70
Figure 4.1: Three possible scenarios of time with respect to remote viewing	87
Figure 4.2: Time plots of two populations	90
Figure 4.3: Phase diagram of two interacting populations	92
Figure 4.4: Directional field diagram for two interacting populations	93
Figure 4.5: Sketch of a football stadium	102
Figure 4.6: A sketch of a structure	103
Figure 4.7: A sketch of a structure	104
Figure 4.8: Locational sketch of structures on a mountain	105
Figure 4.9: Locational sketch of structures showing foliage	106
Figure 6.1: Sketch of the Washington Monument	158
Figure 6.2a: Sketch of what appears to be the Lincoln Memorial	158
Figure 6.2b: Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial	159
Figure 6.3a: Sketch of the Eiffel Tower	161
Figure 6.3b: The Eiffel Tower	162
Figure 6.4a: Sketch of a structure with triangular topology	164
Figure 6.4b: Bon Homme Richard battles HMS Serapis	164
Figure 6.5a: Sketch of a subject with a hat	165
Figure 6.5b: John Paul Jones	165
Figure 6.6: Sketch of Mt. Everest	167
Figure 6.7: Sketch of Mt. Everest region	167
Figure 6.8: Sketch of the Leaning Tower of Pisa as it appeared in 1179 A.D.	169
Figure 6.9: Sketch of Leaning Tower of Pisa and nearby buildings	170
Figure 6.10: Sketch of the Duomo	170
Figure 6.11a: Sketch of the Leaning Tower of Pisa, the Duomo, and a nearby structure	171
Figure 6.11b: The Leaning Tower of Pisa with Duomo	171
Figure 6.12: A sketch of an iceberg	173
Figure 6.13: A sketch of a snowy mountain	173
Figure 6.14: A sketch of a subject on rough, snowy terrain	174
Figure 6.15: Billowy snow blowing around a white mountain	175
Figure 6.16: Sketch of a subject with bulky clothing	175
Figure 6.17: Sketch of a structure in Pompeii, Italy	177
Figure 6.18a: Sketch of Pompeii, Italy during volcanic destruction	178
Figure 6.18b: Pompeii (forum) and Mount Vesuvius	178

Figure 6.19: Subject with toga-style clothing	180
Figure 6.20: Sketch of a boat with a canon	180
Figure 7.1: Hubble Space Telescope target	203
Figure 7.2: Remote-viewing sketch of Hubble Space Telescope target	204
Figure 7.3: RV visual approximation #1 of Hubble Space Telescope target	205
Figure 7.4: RV visual approximation #2 of Hubble Space Telescope target	206
Figure 7.5: The Sphinx and pyramids RV target	207
Figure 7.6: RV visual approximation of Sphinx and pyramids	207
Figure 7.7: RV sketch of the Sphinx in Giza, Egypt	209
Figure 7.8: RV sketch of pyramid in Giza, Egypt	210
Figure 7.9: Two-target attractor model of competing remote-viewing perceptions	213
Figure 8.1: Simple one-dimensional universe in a two-dimensional space	223
Figure 8.2: Two-dimensional universe in a three-dimensional space	224
Figure 8.3: Multiple two-dimensional universes in a three-dimensional space	225
Figure 8.4: The two-slit experiment	229
Figure 8.5: Galactic version of the two-slit experiment	232
Figure 8.6: Sine waves	244
Figure 8.7: A wave packet	245
Figure 8.8: X-axis values plotted over time for the four-dimensional harmonic oscillator	249
Figure 8.9: The harmonic oscillator as seen from the side (a Lissajous figure)	250
Figure 8.10: The harmonic oscillator as seen from above	251
Figure 8.11: The Lissajous figure as seen from a perspective of entering the cylinder shape from above	252
Figure 8.12: Planck standing waves in a probabilistic universe	254
Figure 8.13: A standing Planck wave over a photon's probability sequence axis	257
Figure 8.14: A line with three equally-spaced points	259

Preface (Revised May 2006)

When Carl Sagan coined the phrase, “extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence,” it is doubtful that many realized how much damage was done to the scientific enterprise. This elevated-threshold demand had never before been a requirement of scientific inquiry. But unfortunately, this demand has been used in recent years to deter a willingness to examine scientific evidence with care and consideration. The reality is that extraordinary claims really require only calm consideration of evident facts, and the call for "extraordinary evidence" is typically used only to refuse to consider these evident facts. For example, Galileo's claim that the Earth revolves around the sun was extraordinary in his day. But he only requested that people calmly examine his observations to see that he was correct. Those who refused to look at his data instead demanded what amounted to "divine proof" of his claims, which was simply an intellectual filibuster intended to avoid change.

For a long while, research into psi (psychic) phenomena has been in a similar situation as compared with the problems encountered by Galileo in his day. Until recently, academia has been highly resistant to open inquiries with respect to psi phenomena. But things are changing. For example, many members of the Society for Scientific Exploration (to mention just one academic group) have a strong interest in psi phenomena. The Society currently publishes the *Journal of Scientific Exploration* which often features papers on the subject of psi phenomena generally, and remote viewing more specifically. Their 2004 membership listing contains approximately 800 members from virtually every state in the United States and most developed countries. Many of these members are academics. The institutions represented include Harvard, Yale, Stanford, most Ivy League universities, the most prestigious private and public universities, and so on. Clearly there exists a body of intelligent people today who want to openly discuss the subject of psi phenomena.

This book is about the subject of remote viewing, a specific phenomenon that falls within the more general category of psi phenomena. Remote viewers typically employ a set of clearly defined procedures to describe things that are not accessible to their normal senses of hearing, touch, sight, taste, or smell. The remote viewers always work “blind,” in the sense that they are never given any information regarding what they are asked to perceive until after all of their psychic perceptions are recorded. (Indeed, remote viewing normally does not work at all if the remote viewers are given any advance information about a target.) Scientific controls require this (plus much more, as is explained

elsewhere in this volume). Yet regardless of how rigorously the scientific controls have been followed in the collection and analysis of the data presented in this volume, nowhere in this book is there a demand that readers must accept the reality of remote viewing. This is simply a book of data and theory. All that is asked of the reader is that the material in the book be given calm consideration. The time seems truly ripe both inside and outside of academia for the subject of remote viewing to be examined with full seriousness. It is not difficult for any serious researcher to conduct sensible experiments with this phenomenon without soon realizing that the phenomenon itself is real, and that its reality has profound implications for all of humanity, and for science. This is the moment to engage in a serious dialogue about remote viewing and its related issues.

To clear up a common misconception right at the outset, let me state unambiguously that all remote-viewing data are always speculative until they are verified using normal physical means of obtaining information. One can never say that something is real because someone has “remote viewed it.” Data collected using remote viewing always needs to be compared in detail with information obtained using physical methods before one can evaluate the accuracy of the remote-viewing data. Thus, while it may be possible for remote-viewing data to sometimes be 100% accurate, one never knows this until the data are compared with the known and verified physical characteristics of whatever the remote viewer was supposed to be perceiving. In laboratory situations, this verification process can take anywhere from a few minutes to a number of days or weeks. But in situations in which the remote viewer perceives something that cannot be verified easily, the verification process can take much longer, even many years. Until this verification process is completed (however long it takes), the remote-viewing data will remain speculative. If the data cannot be verified at all, then the data can never leave the realm of speculation, no matter how good the track record of a remote viewer’s accuracy.

In this volume, many remote-viewing results are presented. The results were obtained across a variety of distinctly different projects. Each project was initiated in an attempt to learn something new about the phenomenon of remote viewing. This required laboratory conditions for the experiments, and thus exact verification of the remote-viewing results was essential. Thus, readers will learn a great deal that is very concrete about remote viewing by reading this volume. The remote-viewing data presented here have been fully verified and are not speculative any longer, even though the interpretation of these results may continue to provoke healthy debate. There are no esoteric topics discussed in this volume. If you, the reader, wish to know why remote viewing works, and how to avoid the commonly encountered pitfalls that corrupt the functionality of remote viewing, then you will find many answers among these pages. If along the way you gain further insight into humankind’s spiritual nature, then you will have found an added bonus to your reading efforts.

Let me briefly turn to the issue of money. People can be so easily misled by those who argue that the only reason for one to conduct research in the area of psi phenomena is to make money, usually by appealing to the superstitions of others. Let me remove that potential impediment now. The research presented in this volume was conducted by myself and others associated with The Farsight Institute, a nonprofit research and educational organization. I am the Director of the Institute. I have never received any financial compensation for my work as Director of The Farsight Institute. Indeed, the reverse is true; I have contributed thousands of dollars to the Institute to help support research into the remote-viewing phenomenon.

The History of the Book Manuscript

The research presented in this book deals only with basic science issues relating to the remote-viewing phenomenon. That is, this book does not present an application of remote viewing, but an explanation of remote viewing itself. This does not mean that the book is boring. Indeed, I consider the research presented in this volume to be much more interesting and exciting than any application (esoteric or otherwise) could ever be.

I originally intended to publish this book in an academic press that involved a peer-review process. An editor-in-chief of a major university press was interested in the manuscript for this book, and he undertook to have the manuscript peer reviewed. Since the topic of remote viewing was (and still is) quite controversial for an academic press, the editor decided to err on the side of safety, and the peer-review process took four years and included reviews from a seemingly countless list of famous academics. This long peer-review process turned out to be a great blessing as I explain below, and the editor deserves great credit for helping to shepherd this project through so many phases. The manuscript went through numerous major revisions in which I did nearly everything that any reviewer asked me to do. The final major revision alone had six reviewers (two are normal for most manuscripts, with or without revisions). The overall peer-review process included academics who minimally spanned the disciplines of physics, psychology, sociology, statistics, and engineering. Four of the final six reviewers emphatically argued in favor of publishing the manuscript. Each of these four reviewers gave evidence of having closely read the manuscript, since their reviews engaged the manuscript at various points throughout the work. But the other two reviewers just as emphatically dismissed remote viewing as a real phenomenon and argued against publication for that reason. At first I felt that the negative reviews could be overcome since they appeared to me to have significant weaknesses. One of the negative reviewers posited that remote viewing was analogous to a “pagan religion.” Other comments left me wondering how closely this reviewer read the manuscript, or even if it was read at all. The other negative reviewer gave some mention of the

initial parts of the manuscript, but argued that even the claim that the remote-viewing phenomenon exists is excessive.

Given the difficulty faced by any scholar who wants to publish a book on this topic with a university press, I was quite happy with the outcome of the peer-review process on a substantive level. But for the press to publish the work, it would have required that the project be supported by the press's editorial committee, which is largely composed of faculty members, one or more of whom were quite conservative in their views with respect to controversial topics of this sort. This is a typical situation for most academic presses. Thus, despite considerable support from some of the reviewers, the management of the press ultimately felt the reviews collectively fell short of providing sufficient support to move forward toward publication. In retrospect, I now think that it is currently impossible to publish any book that supportively engages the subject of remote viewing in most (and perhaps all) academic presses, although I hope this changes one day. I know there are many academics who would like to read about this subject. Serious controversy with regard to many topics will naturally result in split reviews that are passionately argued, and academic presses will have to live with such arguments among the reviewers if the peer-review process is not to degrade into a "black-ball" situation where controversial topics are concerned.

Nonetheless, the peer-review process greatly helped me in writing this volume. Indeed, for four years some of the smartest minds on the planet gave me some of the greatest advice anyone could ask for, and I am deeply grateful to all of the reviewers, even (and often especially) the negative ones. Although this book was not ultimately published by the university press which sent it through such a long, thorough, and generally positive peer-review process, it can nonetheless be stated without ambiguity that the book gained all the benefits that are normally associated with peer-review. The primary characteristic of any working peer-review process is that the author is assisted by the reviewers in the production of a superior book, and to this end, the peer-review process worked well.

This volume is the first in a new series published by Farsight Press in the science of remote viewing. The series focuses on remote viewing as it is practiced using some of the remote-viewing styles that are derivative of those used by the U.S. military in applied espionage work. These styles normally involve having a remote viewer perceive a single target over an extended period of time (an hour or more) while using an explicit set of data-collection procedures. This series is not limited to studies which utilize data collected with only one style of such procedures (i.e., CRV, HRVG, SRV, etc.).

More generally, Farsight Press is dedicated to publishing scientific research that addresses topics related to remote viewing and consciousness. The venues available for such research are presently quite limited. On one hand, the topic of remote viewing currently appears to be too controversial to be published by

an academic press. But on the other hand, serious science involving remote viewing is too complex to be supported by most commercial presses that associate the topic with a “new age” market that is primarily disposed toward subjective biographical reports and “soft science.” Thus, Farsight Press offers itself as a venue for scientific work that might otherwise be ideally suited for an academic press, were it not for the controversial nature of the subject matter.

Some Special People

This brings me to the matter of who supported the research presented in this volume. All of the research presented here was supported by private contributions made to The Farsight Institute. Although I am an academic in an American university, no resources of any kind originating from my university (including time) were used to support this research or the preparation of this book. As readers will surmise once they finish this volume, I consider the results presented in this volume to be highly significant to the academy (defined as all university and other research and educational institutions). Perhaps it will one day be common for universities to support the type of research that is presented here. But until that time arrives, such research requires the assistance of private individuals who contribute their time, advice, and financial resources to the advancement of this branch of science.

I must offer special thanks to Michael R. Duval. Mike Duval was a lawyer who served in the top echelon of the White House under both the Nixon and Ford administrations. He was also a remarkably good remote-viewing student of mine, and a member of The Farsight Institute’s Board of Directors for a few years. He died in 2001 (see obituary by Wolfgang Saxon, *The New York Times*, Monday, 23 April 2001, p. A19[N]). Mike Duval, more than anyone else, is the reason this volume exists. Long ago, when I was just beginning to teach remote viewing, he told me that I should separate the applications of remote viewing from research into the basic science of the phenomenon. Moreover, he told me that I should re-direct The Farsight Institute to focus only on basic science questions, while leaving individual remote viewers to pursue applied interests on their own. Finally, he told me to write a book about the basic science of remote viewing that would be directly applicable to the type and style of remote viewing that was being conducted at the Institute as well as by many of the former military remote viewers (that is, long sessions using structured protocols that result in lots of data for single targets). I generally did whatever Mike told me to do, and he was always correct. I cannot think of a single piece of advice which he ever offered to me that turned out to be wrong. If he was talented enough to be called upon to advise two presidents, I would have been the fool to ignore his advice. Years later, this manuscript was completed. Yet even now, from time to time when I close my eyes, I thank him, and miss him. I do not think I have ever missed someone so dearly, or for so long. As the reader will

surmise after finishing this book, I do not doubt that I will see Mike again, somewhere in the eternity of tomorrow. I look forward to that moment of reunion.

I am very grateful for the friendship and support of Dr. John Russell. Dr. Russell is a physicist who formerly taught nuclear engineering at Georgia Institute of Technology. He is also the inventor of the first palladium SEEDS. SEEDS are those little rice-sized radioactive pellets that are used to treat various forms of cancer, including and especially prostate cancer in men (see Russell 2004). He has helped to tutor me in theories of physics, and he was instrumental in helping me work through many of the ideas that I have presented in this volume, especially with regard to chapter 8. He is also the person who urged me to consider that the phenomenon of entanglement may be at the core of the remote-viewing phenomenon.

Father John Rossner, an Anglican priest and professor at Concordia University in Montreal, has given me an enormous amount of good advice and insight over the years. He and his wife, Marilyn, are among the most spiritually gifted people I know. As directing officers of the International Institute of Integral Human Sciences, they quite often brought me to Montreal to give lectures. But when I went, I did as much listening as talking, and I undoubtedly received more wisdom than I offered with each trip. I would often ask John about complex issues that I would be dealing with in the manuscript, and I was always astounded that he inevitably had something important to say. I am grateful for his guidance.

In particular, I wish to thank Mr. Gilbert Younger, a man who is as comfortable with issues of spirituality as he is with practical business matters. This volume could not have been written without his support. I also wish to thank Mrs. Mieke Freeman and Ms. Maria M. Hallsthammar. I doubt they will ever really know the full value of their contributions. Many others contributed in non-financial ways, some by participating in remote-viewing experiments, while others in different ways. No one was ever paid anything for participating in the research presented in this volume. In this day and age in which scientific research tends to follow dollars, these investigations remind us of the value of personal commitment and volunteering. In particular, I want to thank Matthew Pfeiffer, Joey Jerome, Denise Burson, Richard Moore, Roma Zanders, all of whom contributed their time freely and without meagerness to these research efforts. I also want to thank Lynda Cowen, Diane Moore, and Dee Leslie who have worked tirelessly to support the continuing educational and research roles of The Farsight Institute, especially in recent years. Pierre Juneau also has been very helpful in a variety of informal ways, and I am grateful for his assistance and ideas.

A Note of Caution Regarding the Media

I would like to include here a note of caution that I think many of my fellow academics may value. My initial activities to investigate the remote-viewing phenomenon included a public phase, and it is toward the idea of conducting research within public view that I wish to direct my note of caution. I have always considered the subject of remote viewing an exciting area of research that would interest many people, including academics such as myself. To this end, I founded The Farsight Institute as a nonprofit research and educational organization to house the research efforts of myself and others. I did this as an act of service to both the public and the academic community.

But in early 1997, I made the decision to reduce dramatically the public presence of The Farsight Institute. I also decided to shift the focus of research done at the Institute away from all applications of remote viewing, and instead to concentrate all of our efforts on basic science issues relating to the remote-viewing phenomenon itself. We needed a long quiet period within which to conduct our experiments, and I was certain that the public would be better served by our nonprofit research and educational organization if we pursued our research program in a less visible manner. Also, by that time I had become deeply discouraged by my own experiences with the media. I realized that as an academic, I had neither the training nor the resources to manage either the media treatment of — or the public's response to — the presentation of topics about which there may be considerable controversy. Some of my own experiences with the media were searingly painful, and I share one of them below as a means of offering guidance (and a warning) to other academics or scientists who may be seeking the most productive means of exposing the public to the results of their own research. I made many mistakes. Learn from them.

In terms of background, Chuck Shramek, a now-deceased amateur astronomer photographed what appeared to be an anomaly briefly and intermittently associated with the Hale-Bopp comet in late 1996. Mr. Shramek was a respected newscaster in Houston, Texas, and his interest in astronomy was serious. As with many amateur astronomers, he was particularly fascinated with comets. He took a large number of photographs of the Hale-Bopp comet, and he posted one of these images on his web site. It is an understatement to say that it caused a significant stir at the time. He was surprised that the major observatories (including the Hubble Space Telescope) seemed to be posting few high-quality images of the Hale-Bopp comet on the Internet. It was frustration with this that led Mr. Shramek to photograph the comet himself with his 10-inch scope. In an email that he sent me two years later in April 1999, he wrote, "To this day, there never has been any clear pictures of the comet nucleus released to the public." He seemed quite concerned that some of the best photographs of the comet available to the public had been taken by a large collection of amateur astronomers using telescopes costing just a few thousand dollars, and he

expressed doubts over the official position that the Hubble took only a few low-quality images of the comet. Since I am not an astronomer, I do not have the ability to verify these ideas, but it seems clear to me that Mr. Shramek's motivations were sincere.

Shortly after Shramek released his photo in late 1996 and in-between working on normal verifiable projects, at my suggestion some remote viewers at The Farsight Institute attempted to remote view a variety of celestial objects (speculatively and somewhat lightheartedly, since verification was impossible). The anomaly apparently associated with the Hale-Bopp comet was one of these unverifiable taskings. The remote viewers collected their data "blind," which means that they did not know anything about the target when they conducted their remote-viewing sessions. Also, the target tasked to the remote viewers (the identity of which was revealed to them only after they collected their data) was verbal in nature and did not reference any photograph. I talked about these speculative remote-viewing results on the program of a popular radio talk-show host who regularly invites guests on his show who present unverifiable ideas dealing with a wide range of esoteric topics.

Speculating on extraterrestrial issues is essentially a hobby of mine, and I saw no harm at the time in engaging in such speculations on a radio talk show that seemed to specialize in exactly this sort of thing. My discussion of the remote-viewing results characterized them as highly interesting and suggestive, albeit unverifiable. I never claimed that the remote-viewing perceptions were 100% accurate, and in fact did comment that some remote viewers have notably better accuracy histories than others. To this day, I still do not fully understand those remote-viewing perceptions, interesting though they may be. In retrospect, I now know that it is unwise to discuss remote-viewing results publicly before more fully understanding them. When the program ended, I naively thought that was the end of the matter.

After this radio appearance, a person whose identity I do not know with any confidence sent our Institute's web master some unsolicited astronomical images on 35 mm film of what appeared to be the same anomaly. Our web master claimed to know this person relatively well, although I cannot corroborate this. I was told that this person was an astronomer, however I now suspect that the person may have had only a tangential connection to astronomy at best. It was my fault for not demanding more information about this person at the time. I held and examined the images using a slide lupe (a magnifying glass) only once ever, and even then only for a few minutes. At the time, the pictures themselves appeared to me to be exceptionally high resolution black and white digital images that seemed to have been taken with a telescope equipped with a CCD imaging system and later transferred to the hard drive of a computer before being printed to film. This was obvious (at least to me) since razor-sharp pixel lines of a CCD system were clearly visible on the developed film when examined using a magnifying glass. These were my impressions, although I am not an

authority in such matters. The 35 mm film that was sent to us had been exposed (prior to being mailed to us) using a film printer connected to a computer, which is the only way a digital image of this sort can be printed on film. The film clearly did not appear to have been originally exposed in a camera directly connected to a telescope, although subsequent rumors to this effect that spread over the Internet became virtually impossible to control.

Film printers of the sort mentioned above are similar to other computer printers except that they print on photographic negative and slide film rather than on paper. One has to develop the film after the printer exposes it in order to see the image. For those readers unfamiliar with such film printers, they have long been used by presenters to create slides for PowerPoint presentations. They are less commonly encountered nowadays since most presenters use a laptop computer connected to a data projector to show their presentations.

After receiving the film (we were actually sent three rolls), we had it processed at a local camera store. Of the three rolls we were sent, only one had any images on it. We assumed that the person who sent us the film created the exposures and printed them to the film, but we do not know if this is the case (and in retrospect, it seems doubtful). As curious as it was to receive such photos in the mail (since it was not clear why a serious astronomer would be taking us seriously at that point), the photos were of only minor interest to us since (1) they did not add to what was already apparent in Mr. Shramek's photos of the same scene, (2) they were not ours, and (3) we had no expertise in analyzing photographs (astronomical or otherwise).

I happened to mention the existence of the images in passing to the same radio talk-show host on whose program I had appeared earlier. I did not bring up the subject of the photos in the context of wanting to talk about them on his radio show. He later raised the subject of whether I could do something to help Chuck Shramek, who was being verbally attacked by others in connection with his own astronomical image. I initially hesitated to do anything, but later offered (unwisely) to talk anecdotally about the unsolicited images that were sent to our web master. I informed him clearly that the photos were not ours, and since we did not own them we could talk about them only anecdotally without releasing them to the public. The issue of not releasing something for which we did not own the copyright was (for me at least) as important as it was obvious. I naively thought that the discussion of the photos on the radio would naturally lead to a more general conversation about remote viewing, which was my primary interest. At the request of the talk-show host, we emailed the host, and one of his other guests who was to be on the show, two copies of a crude scan of one of the original film images to serve as a focus for the radio conversation. Both copies were filtered with Photoshop (color added), and one was marked-up with a circle and an arrow to identify the anomaly. We (and the Institute) thought there was a clear verbal agreement between myself and the talk-show host (later disputed) that the images were not to be released to the public. It was my

understanding that the person who sent us the photos encouraged us to share them with our friends and colleagues, and so I saw no harm in sharing them with the talk-show host under the conditions that the images not be released to the public. At the Institute, we never used the photos for anything relating to our remote-viewing work or anything else, and in retrospect it was an error in judgment (actually, it was stupid) for us to discuss on air — anecdotally or otherwise — something that we did not produce ourselves or use in any way.

It is important to emphasize that I was very wrong to think that a media personality would not release the photos to the public indefinitely. At the time, I did not fully appreciate that the job of media personalities is to present news to the public, not to withhold it. Yes, I was terribly naive. I was inexperienced at dealing with the media, a condition not uncommon for most academics.

The radio appearance occurred on Thanksgiving evening in November of 1996 and began with me speaking for one hour introducing the Institute's web master and summarizing the basic points: (1) the photos appeared interesting but they were not ours, and (2) they were sent to our web master by someone whom she claimed to know personally. In general, I was mostly out of the loop since only our web master knew who sent the photos. I then talked a bit more about remote viewing, which was my real purpose for wanting to be on the radio. Then our web master got on the radio and discussed the photos and her interactions (via telephone) with the person who sent the photos. She claimed that the person who sent her the photos did not want his or her identity revealed prematurely, and that this person was to have a news conference discussing the photos in about a week or two. (Incredibly, in retrospect, we believed this.) She also vouched for the respectability of this person. As it turned out, the person who mailed our web master the photos never held the promised news conference. With each passing day following the radio appearance, it looked more and more like we had been snookered.

The talk-show host soon published the photos on his web site against our wishes and made them into a huge controversial story over which we had no control, especially since we were not on the radio with any significant frequency (and never again on his show after January 1997). Fortunately, during my final appearance on his show, the host played a recording of me asking him not to release the photos, so it was clear to everyone that it was he who was releasing the photos, not us.

Within what seemed like a blink of an eye (about one day), an astronomer from the University of Hawaii contacted the talk-show host stating that the photos were his, and that they were obtained from a publicly available university web site and altered. He even offered a brief technical analysis arguing why he thought his web photo was the same as our crude scan. The astronomer never examined the original 35 mm film from which our scan was made, nor did he contact me personally and request to see the film. I suspect that he simply assumed (understandably) that there never was any 35 mm film in the first place.

Indeed, a statement from a University of Hawaii's web site asserts, "While it cannot be proven unambiguously, the fact that the fine structure of both the fake and the original image are matching so well suggest that the whole process was digital, without any film roll and scanner involved" (http://www.ifa.hawaii.edu/images/hale-bopp/tholen-sep1/hb_ufo_tholen.html#stat).

Rumors abounded, and people even began posting on the Internet technical and logical arguments both supporting and contesting the astronomer's claims, some remarking (for example) that the stars did not seem to align perfectly when the images were carefully placed on top of one another, suggesting that they may have been taken minutes apart, perhaps by different telescopes. Some analysts even claimed to have found suggestions of residual evidence of the apparent anomaly in the official University of Hawaii photograph due to a crescent shape strangely outlined in the tail of the comet that seemed to correspond closely with the anomaly's appearance in the other image that we were sent. Not being a photographic expert, and not wanting to be drawn into trying to defend a photographic image that I had no part in producing and which I never released to the public, I simply avoided this part of the debate. The astronomer from the University of Hawaii appeared in his writings to be quite upset with me, which dismayed me deeply since it was obvious that (1) I always said the photos were not ours and that I did not know their origin, and again (2) I never released the photos to the public in the first place!

Quite frankly, I truly do not know how the person who mailed our web master the photos obtained them, and I do not know if they were legitimate or forged. I also have never suggested that anyone from the University of Hawaii was involved in this. To my eye, the originals seemed far too high resolution to have come from a web site, and I could not figure out why anyone would even want to print web photos on a 35 mm film printer. But since digital creativity can do almost anything to an image, including inserting what can pass as CCD pixel lines, I have no way of knowing if the photos were contrived or real. Again, I am not an expert in photography or astronomy. Nonetheless, from the public's perspective, it was looking more and more like we had done something wrong, and I kept repeating to myself my amazement at how we could be publicly blamed for trying to mislead the public when the photos were not ours, and we never released the photos to the public. We were stuck in the middle between someone who sent us materials with a request to remain anonymous (which we honored regardless of whether or not he was conning us) and an aggressive talk-show host who demanded details of the photos and their apparent dubious origin.

We were banished from the talk-show host's radio program following a highly confrontational appearance in January of 1997 in which I tried vainly to set the record straight (as I saw it) and place the situation in perspective. Indeed, we impotently watched over the following weeks and months as the talk-show

host conducted on his radio program and his web site what seemed to us to be a very intense, long, and loud campaign against us. This continued even years later when he flew to Atlanta to appear on the Larry King Live show.

Worse still, soon after my final appearance on this talk-show host's program in January 1997, a former military remote viewer returned to this same talk-show host's radio program, claiming that our original remote-viewing data were not collected properly. He then discussed how his own group of remote viewers had collected their own data (this time done properly) involving the Hale-Bopp comet, and he made the frightening announcement that the comet was carrying a plant pathogen bomb designed by aliens that was going to drop on Africa and wipe out all plant life. He also began to market a remote-viewing instruction kit. This person also disparaged both myself and The Farsight Institute. This was particularly sad for me since I once felt I knew this former military remote viewer rather well, and when I knew him he seemed to me to have a positive and even spiritually-yearning personality. He also previously seemed to have positive working relationships with nearly all of the former military remote viewers, both while still working in the military and for a period afterwards. But things changed rather dramatically and quickly at one point after leaving the military, and it appeared that he grew publicly hostile not only toward me but also toward many of his former military colleagues. These same former colleagues then publicly distanced themselves from him.

Strangely (to me, given my past with this radio host), the talk-show host did not seem interested in forcefully challenging the predictions of planetary disaster made by this former military remote viewer. Instead, the host seemed to enthusiastically support this guest. I am not accusing the talk-show host of anything illegal or immoral. I simply did not understand why he would challenge one guest more than another. Nonetheless, it was clear that the talk-show host felt the former military remote viewer was an interesting guest to have on his show.

Thus, there were three separate themes emitting and intermixing from those confused and wild radio waves at the time: (1) a sustained campaign suggesting that I and The Farsight Institute had been involved in a photographic fraud, combined with a parallel effort (from numerous sources) that appeared aimed at disparaging our understanding of remote viewing, thereby discrediting data we collected using remote viewing (especially about the Hale-Bopp comet), (2) a general and continuing hype about a Hale-Bopp companion, eventually labeled the "Hail Mary," and (3) the airing of claims that aliens somehow related to the Hale-Bopp comet were going to drop planet-scorching, plant-pathogenic weapons of mass destruction on Africa. It is important to note that the talk-show host never publicly said he agreed with all of this (especially points 2 and 3 above). He simply reported it, or allowed others to air the reports. All of this was being witnessed in regular doses on a daily talk show by literally millions of eager radio and Internet talk-show fans worldwide. Reports also suggested

that remote-viewing instruction kits were selling like hot cakes.

And if that was not enough, in late March of 1997, a group of eunuchs belonging to a fanatical cult popularly known as “Heaven’s Gate” committed suicide in San Diego, declaring that they were going to be “beamed up” to the so-called UFO, illogically adding that the so-called UFO may not even exist. Like everyone else at the time, I was dumbstruck and saddened by the horrible and senseless waste of their lives. This group had existed as an organized and secretive cult exhibiting highly abnormal behaviors for many years. Without doubt they suffered from some form of collective mental illness. Clearly no one but the members of the Heaven’s Gate group themselves were responsible for what they did to themselves. Neither the radio talk-show host nor anyone else outside of that group led those people to commit suicide. Indeed, their aging fanatical leader was probably on the lookout for an opportunity to wrap up his adventure into cult worship without having to tell his band of loyal castrati that it had all been a big mistake. Neither I nor anyone I knew had ever previously heard of this group, as I expect was typical for just about everyone back in those days. In general, the media acted responsibly and fairly by not associating myself or The Farsight Institute with this group or that terrible event. News reports indicated that the cult never mentioned me or The Farsight Institute in any of their internal writings, nor did they ever link to our web site from their web site. This was not surprising since the radio talk-show host’s campaign regarding the photo scandal had been so publicly visible over the previous months.

Returning now to the “photo scandal,” it is important to emphasize that the incident essentially resulted from opening the mail and talking anecdotally about what was in the mail. We were admittedly stupid to have talked about what arrived in the mail. But it is useful to take a lesson from how the talk-show host pushed this story. There are no guarantees when dealing with the media. Academics should never feel comforted by the knowledge that a media personality may not have challenged other guests who might have voiced controversial views.

It is important to emphasize that it is not necessary for a media personality to have malicious intent for a disagreement of the sort which I have described here to occur. For example, I am not claiming that the radio talk-show host with whom I had such an unfortunate encounter had a malevolent plan to disparage me. Perhaps he felt pressure from his listeners to get to the bottom of a mystery that seemed intriguing. He also may not have fully understood the pledge of confidentiality that our web master gave the person who sent her the photos. My refusal to force our web master to break her promise of confidentiality and reveal the identity of this person (even if I could have done this) may have led the talk-show host to distrust me. He probably felt he was doing a necessary public service by releasing the photos that we sent him, and in the end, maybe he was.

In general, media personalities simplify topics so that their audiences can

perceive issues in black and white terms. They are not scientists who are willing to live with complexity. Thus, there is a fundamental difference between how media personalities and scientists tend to think, and it is inherently risky for scientists who are involved in controversial research to entrust their findings with the media. More often than not, complex issues will become distorted, and the reputation of the scientists can be damaged.

Also, I do not know the intent of the person who sent us the photos. In retrospect, I consider it highly probable that the person knew the photos would be discredited should they be released (whether or not they were legitimate astronomical images). Possibly this person was used simply as an intermediary (who conveniently knew and was trusted by our web master) for others who supplied the photos, although I have no way of determining this. Again, I have never suggested in any way that anyone at the University of Hawaii was knowingly or unknowingly involved in any act of deception related to this incident. Based on what I was told about the communications between our web master and the person who sent her the controversial images, the person encouraged us to share those photos with our friends and colleagues — without revealing the source of the images. It now seems (to me) likely that this person both wanted and expected the photos to be released eventually, leaving us “holding the bag,” so to speak. Again in retrospect, had our web master relented under the pressure and publicly identified the person who mailed her the photos, it seems certain that the person would have subsequently sued our Institute for defamation of character, effectively closing down the Institute. If we are to be honest with ourselves, such traps are easy to set-up, and academics have no prior training in avoiding them. We tend to believe people at face value, just as we tend to believe our colleagues when they conduct experiments. Indeed, a dependence on intellectual honesty is a cornerstone of academic inquiry. As a result, academics in general are highly vulnerable to those who seek to entrap or deceive, and we would be foolish to think that our intelligence or academic training could fully protect us in situations such as this.

Additionally, it is a fact of life that elements of the public are prone to react wildly to the presentation of controversial information, even if that information is presented as speculative. For example and with respect to remote viewing, the reality of this phenomenon may continue to collide with misunderstandings and superstitions held by elements of the public. It is precisely because our society has so much to learn from scientific research into remote viewing that confusion can occur when new information is presented to it. There is always the risk that some people may act tragically when their unfounded beliefs interact with their misunderstandings of new ideas. There is also the near certainty that opportunists will react to exploit those misunderstandings for personal profit. There is no easy way for science to control this. Ultimately, scientists need to decide for themselves as to whether or not the long-term benefit to society gained by exposing the public to new ideas is worth the short-term risk of havoc.

The former attacks ignorance, while the latter attacks science itself.

When controversies occur, they can last a long time, regardless of the accuracy of the claims upon which they are based. They develop a “self-referral” quality due to the open-source nature of the Internet, since one posting can refer to another, which can refer to another, which can refer to the original, and so on, suggesting that a solid case has been established. This can extend the life of a controversy essentially indefinitely. Attempts to correct the inaccuracies associated with the controversies can lead to endless Internet-based attacks and counter-attacks, and ultimately it is usually not worth the effort to try to make such corrections.

Thus, my warning to my fellow academics is that if you conduct controversial research, do not seek out the media, and never modify what you do to satisfy an interview request from a media personality. The risk of long-term mayhem is just too great. Keep your head low.

Where We Are Now

By January 1997, we at the Institute decided that it was best not to interact with the public at all when we did our research. We embarked on a long-term plan to focus only on basic science issues relating to the remote-viewing phenomenon. We began to take much of our work out of public view, even taking our entire web site off-line for a number of months while we re-formulated how we wanted to proceed. Learning to manage complex interactions with the media became a moot concern, since our primary interest became how to avoid most of the media.

Fortunately, the past difficulties with the media have had little long-term impact on our institute. Indeed, the public reputation of The Farsight Institute has continued to grow since those early days, which is particularly interesting considering that we have so carefully avoided media exposure. Our web site receives tens of thousands of visitors each month, most of whom seem largely drawn by our extensive collection of free information about remote viewing, including a large quantity of free instructional material. We have conducted repeated public demonstrations of remote viewing under highly controlled conditions that were witnessed (and participated in) by literally thousands of web site visitors. We maintain full documentation about all of this plus much more on our web site. Moreover, people seem to have fully accepted the nonprofit nature of The Farsight Institute, as well as the fact that I have never profited financially in any way through my activities as Director of the Institute.

Our retreat from the media allowed us to conduct a significant amount of research over the past few years with few distractions. As a result, I believe we have resolved perhaps the most perplexing issue that has faced remote-viewing research for the past few decades: the identification of the psychic-targeting mechanism that directs a remote viewer’s consciousness to perceive a given

place or event. This discovery alone is enormously valuable, and it promises to make remote viewing a much more reliable phenomenon, a crucial consideration for future scientific investigation. While the topics discussed in this volume are quite diverse, a close reading will reveal that this discovery is at the core of much of the research presented here.

Due to the diversity of material presented in this volume, some readers may be tempted to jump to chapters of particular interest. However, my own suggestion is for readers to proceed systematically, chapter by chapter. The presentation of this material is organized to build sequentially on related ideas, and to jump to a middle chapter before reading the preceding information may result in the loss of the argument's logic. At the risk of sounding professorial, there is a lot of content to absorb in these pages, and patience in going through it all will likely result in the most productive reading experience.

CHAPTER 1

The Open Mind

Humanity is soon to experience one of the greatest revolutions in the realm of ideas that has ever occurred. Imagine the discovery of a phenomenon that suggests that communication across huge distances — including interstellar distances — can be done instantaneously and with little or no cost. Imagine the discovery of a phenomenon that gives evidence that time may only be an artifact of human perception. Imagine the discovery of a phenomenon that indicates that the past, present, and future exist simultaneously (that is, all at once in the here and now), and that alternate futures and even alternate pasts may also exist. Imagine the discovery of a phenomenon that suggests that we may all live multiple lives in multiple realities, all but one of which seem hidden from us. Imagine the discovery of a phenomenon that appears to offer evidence that the human soul is real. And finally, imagine that this same phenomenon can be experienced personally by normal people (albeit with significant care and effort) without the assistance of expensive machinery like a particle accelerator, space ship, or nuclear reactor. This phenomenon is remote viewing, and its discovery promises to have an impact on all of our lives.

To frame the significance of the discovery of the remote-viewing phenomenon in terms of just one of these points, consider the issue of the existence of the human soul. Whether all of us are ready for this or not, we will probably soon witness the spectacle of science seriously entertaining the idea that the human soul is real. This issue alone is a “show-stopper” of historic proportions. Nothing is more important to our existence as humans than the understanding that we are more than our physical bodies. We pray that our souls are saved. We receive counsel from ministers, rabbis, priests, and others, and many of us try to navigate our lives to a successful Heavenly ending. But Western science has never been able to place a stamp of approval on the notion that consciousness is not limited to the physical brain. It is likely that this period of scientific denial of consciousness beyond the physical may be approaching an end. Science may soon have no alternative but to grapple with the evidence that indicates that we truly are more than our physical bodies. Understanding the phenomenon of remote viewing is the key to all of this. Moreover, the science of remote viewing has matured in recent years such that virtually everyone so-interested can understand this phenomenon and its implications.

Imagine a person, say “Tom,” who is told to describe a particular location or event at some point in time. Tom is not told anything about when or where

this location or event happens to be. Indeed, this location or event is simply called a “target” in a generic fashion, and he is told to describe “the target,” whatever it may be. He then goes into a room that is ideally designed for such purposes. The colors of the walls are bland, as is the color of the carpet on the floor. There are no pictures on the wall to distract him. The doors of the room are closed, and in the room is only one desk, located in the room’s center, and pointed toward a corner rather than a wall. Any recording equipment in the room is located behind the desk so that it remains out of his view. Tom has just completed a “cool down” period that settles his mind, and he sits down at the desk and begins writing on pieces of plain white paper. Approximately one hour later, Tom emerges from the room with, say, 20 pieces of paper containing detailed descriptions of the target. The descriptions include accurate sketches of the target, plus verbal descriptions of people, activity, and things that are at the target location. He did this without being told anything at all about the target. Only after Tom completes his written description is he told what the target actually is.

If the above scenario is not mind-boggling enough, consider the fact that Tom is able to do this same feat even if the target has not yet been chosen at the time he is writing his descriptions of the target! That is, he not only is describing the target accurately, he is describing the target that will be chosen only in the future. Moreover, the person who will choose the target will be given no information regarding Tom’s description of the target. Both will be “blind” to one another. What Tom is doing is “remote viewing.” What he is also doing is forever changing the way humans conceive of their own existence.

The study of remote viewing is a relatively new scientific field, and there has been tremendous controversy about it in recent years. It would be wrong for me to disparage those who have doubts about even the possibility of remote viewing. There are real reasons for such doubts. I can say this even though there is no doubt in my mind that remote viewing is a real phenomenon, and that the widespread recognition of this phenomenon will bring fundamental change to science and society. But before discussing the legitimacy of doubt, it is important to define what we are talking about when we discuss remote viewing.

What Is Remote Viewing?

Remote viewing is a psi-based mental process. People who know much about remote viewing agree on at least that much. But beyond that there is considerable disagreement. The term “remote viewing” was used by the United States military in defense-related research projects from the 1970s through much of the 1990s. Probably because of this, the term appears to have developed a permanent place in the public’s vocabulary of psychic phenomena. However, remote viewing can mean different things to different people. It typically involves the ability of a person to perceive and describe some thing or place that

is separate from him or her in space and/or time. Not surprisingly, because remote viewers were often called upon to describe and draw visual information, visual concepts often dominated the early discussions of this phenomenon. But remote viewing is not limited to visual information. Some scientists have desired to use other more general terms to describe psi functioning, such as Dr. Edwin May's recent and useful coining of the term "anomalous cognition." Nonetheless, the term "remote viewing" is likely to remain the term most widely recognized by many people as referring to the apparently psychic ability to describe distant places and events.

Pioneering researchers at a few scientific laboratories, such as SRI International, Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), Princeton Engineering Anomalous Research (PEAR), and elsewhere have spent years investigating the remote-viewing phenomenon. A significant and growing number of scientific papers have been published in distinguished peer-reviewed outlets that describe the investigations of the researchers in these laboratories in considerable detail. Within this field, there is no single method of remote viewing that is universally accepted as dominant, or even preferred. A recent book by the talented remote viewer, Joseph McMoneagle, *Remote Viewing Secrets: A Handbook*, contains good descriptions of the remote-viewing methods and controls that have been used in many of these laboratories. Some of the remote-viewing methods have military origins, have become quite standardized, and are known by specific names, such as "HRVG Protocols," "Extended Remote Viewing" (ERV) and "Controlled Remote Viewing" (CRV). (See McMoneagle 2000, pp. 95-101.) Some remote viewers have developed their own individualized methods that seem to work for them. Others have simply followed instructions as given to them by the primary investigators of a given project. The overall range of these methods varies from simply trying to "sense what's out there," to more structured processes involving meditation, detailed procedures, and other techniques. What is common among most of the laboratory experiments is not so much the remote-viewing methodology used by the test subjects, but the scientific procedures used to evaluate the existence of psi phenomena. These procedures tend to be highly sophisticated, and they address a large variety of scientific ideas, such as blind vs. double-blind testing environments and statistical controls.

The remote-viewing methodology that is used in all of the experiments described in this volume is a set of procedures known as "Scientific Remote Viewing." Scientific Remote Viewing evolved originally from Controlled Remote Viewing, procedures often used by U.S. military remote viewers. Scientific Remote Viewing (SRV) is the primary remote-viewing methodology that is used in experiments conducted at The Farsight Institute. SRV has not been used in experiments conducted by the U.S. military, at SRI International, SAIC, or PEAR.

To avoid confusion among the general public regarding the methodological

procedures that are used and developed at The Farsight Institute, “Scientific Remote Viewing” was registered as a service mark of Farsight Inc. Without such protection, others would undoubtedly use the same term, and the ability to explain what we do at the Institute would become nearly impossible. The placement of the word “scientific” in Scientific Remote Viewing does not imply that these procedures are superior to or any more scientific than other structured methods of data collection that may be used elsewhere. Originally, the use of the word “scientific” reflected my own desire to investigate the remote-viewing phenomenon using a single standardized methodology. One of the key elements in scientific research is the desire to control as many variables as possible to enable one to isolate significant influences on a phenomenon, and working with a single standardized remote-viewing methodology is one way of controlling for variations in data collection techniques. Similarly useful and equally valid structured data-gathering processes are the Hawaiian Remote Viewers’ Guild (HRVG) methods, Controlled Remote Viewing (CRV), Extended Remote Viewing (ERV), and some other remote-viewing methodologies that have been developed by an increasingly diverse collection of remote-viewing research groups. But from the perspective of the results presented in this volume, it is useful to point out that a single standardized methodology of data gathering was used in all of the experiments presented here, and this standardization is an essential element of scientific control.

In the next section, and again in parts of chapter 2, I make some observations about Scientific Remote Viewing. But this is a book about remote viewing, not Scientific Remote Viewing. These observations are necessary in order to explain how the experiments discussed in this volume were conducted. These comments should not be interpreted as limiting the relevance of the conclusions that I present here to remote viewing as it is performed using the Scientific Remote Viewing methodology. It is my view that these results are equally valid for remote viewing as it is performed using all other structured remote-viewing methodologies. Indeed, I fully expect that the results presented in this volume will be replicated by others using CRV, HRVG, and other remote-viewing methodologies.

Scientific Remote Viewing

Scientific Remote Viewing (SRV) was developed – and continues to evolve – at The Farsight Institute, a nonprofit research and educational organization that is dedicated to the development of the science of intuitive consciousness as it can be researched via the remote-viewing phenomenon. SRV procedures have a historical link to CRV procedures developed by Ingo Swann while he worked at SRI International as a remote-viewing test subject.

By using a standardized set of remote-viewing procedures, it has been possible to isolate explicit aspects of the remote-viewing phenomenon that

appear both repeatable and robust. We have found that persons proficiently trained in the use of a structured data-collection methodology can use these procedures to obtain surprisingly accurate and detailed descriptive information about distant locations and across time.

As performed at The Farsight Institute, remote viewing is a controlled shifting of awareness that is performed in the normal waking state of consciousness. In a sense, remote viewing uses the human nervous system (with all of its five senses) in a way analogous to how an astronomer uses a radio telescope. Using remote viewing, the human nervous system acts as a tuning device that apparently connects us to an underlying field of nature through which knowledge of many things is possible. But before going further, let us be sure to identify what SRV is not.

- SRV does not involve an out-of-body experience.
- SRV does not use hypnosis.
- SRV does not involve an altered state of consciousness.
- SRV is not channeling.

SRV has a number of distinct phases that the viewer performs sequentially. Each phase is designed to allow the viewer to perceive various aspects of a target. A “target” is the location, structure, person, or event about which information is desired. In each phase, different types of information are extracted about the target, and the overall result typically includes a wide variety of descriptive data, including sketches.

Complete descriptions of all of the mechanics of Scientific Remote Viewing are available for free on the web site for The Farsight Institute (www.farsight.org). This web site offers a large collection of free instructional materials, as well as recordings of remote-viewing sessions (recorded live) and many examples of remote-viewing work. Free file-sharing technologies are sometimes used to aid in the distribution of these materials. Again, The Farsight Institute is a nonprofit research and educational organization, and the materials offered on the web site are free to anyone 18 years of age or older.

While I do not rule out the possibility that someone may one day discover a normal three-dimensional physical basis underlying the remote-viewing phenomenon, my own view is that the ability to train someone to remote view supports the idea that humans have a nonphysical aspect (that is, a soul), since in the absence of such an aspect, it is not clear how remote viewing would be possible. Yet I must be very clear here. “Nonphysical” does not mean that the science of physics does not operate on the level of the soul, and readers will note that chapter 8 in this volume addresses this issue directly. Remote viewing is clearly a phenomenon that works on the physical level, and we will eventually understand with certainty the physical laws underlying its manifestation. But when I state that remote viewing supports the idea that humans have a

nonphysical aspect to themselves, I mean that whatever allows the phenomenon of remote viewing to occur does not depend on our five physical senses of hearing, touch, sight, taste, and smell. Moreover, the remote-viewing mechanism cannot be limited to our current physical understanding of three-dimensional space plus time. Remote viewers do not physically go to a target location to observe with their eyes and other physical senses whatever is there — the information is apparently perceived through a nonlocal mechanism only. (In particular, see my comments regarding entanglement in chapter 8.) I look forward to the day in which we may all understand more about the physics of the soul, and as readers will note upon finishing this volume, my view is that this issue involving physics has a relevancy that vibrantly speaks to many academic fields.

Proof Versus Process

In this volume I do not attempt to “prove” that remote viewing is a real phenomenon. In my view, this has already been accomplished by others elsewhere. (In particular, see Utts 1991, 1996.) The accumulated statistical evidence presented in the literature of this field would have been broadly accepted long ago for a less controversial subject. Proof-oriented research will continue in a variety of settings, and in my own mind I am certain that the eventual universal acceptance of the phenomenon is inevitable.

My aim with this volume is to present the results of a set of experiments that are directed at improving our understanding of the process of remote viewing. I fully expect the results to be widely applicable regardless of the remote-viewing methodology used. With the exception of the chapter concerning the public demonstration of remote viewing, the general approach that I have followed in these investigations is not quantitative, but rather qualitative. With proof-oriented research, quantitative approaches are normally used. This often involves large batches of psi trials, followed by statistical evaluations of the resulting data. Statistical significance is the normal goal of such research, and it is used to establish evidence that the psi phenomenon under investigation did in fact occur. While the quantitative approach is useful in other contexts, my own research plan involves the design of a variety of experiments that might shed light on specific mechanisms influencing the remote-viewing process. Some truly enigmatic phenomena have been reported in the scientific literature on remote viewing, and these puzzles have lent themselves well to carefully designed experiments that exploit the designs’ characteristics. Nonetheless, some readers may first want to deal with the matter of whether or not remote viewing is a real phenomenon prior to entertaining arguments relating to subtleties involved in the process of remote viewing. This addresses the issue of doubt, and it is important for me to spend a moment defending the legitimacy of such doubt.

The Legitimacy of Doubt

It is easy to understand why many may find it difficult to believe that remote viewing is a real phenomenon. Remote viewing relies on a level of perception that is quite alien to our normal means of perceiving the reality that surrounds us. Much of this perception has often been described as intuitive in nature. We normally rely on our five senses of hearing, touch, sight, taste, and smell. Indeed, these five senses dominate our physical waking state of consciousness. All humans have experienced intuitive senses to some degree, but intuition is rarely as reliable as direct perceptions using one or more of the five physical senses. For virtually everyone, there are moments when our intuitive senses seem remarkably accurate. But when we begin to rely repeatedly on these intuitions for practical situations, more often than not they eventually fail us.

For example, most parents have experienced situations in which they perceived intuitively that a child may have been in a difficult or dangerous situation. The parents sometimes telephone the school or house where their child may be, or they may even get into their car and drive to their child's location to check on the youngster's well-being. In some cases the parents' intuitions are very accurate, while in other situations the intuitions seem wildly misplaced. In another example, some people have claimed that their intuitions help them in betting on the stock market, while others say that their intuitions are useless in this regard. When those who rely on their intuitions for purchasing stocks are asked to demonstrate the method of their success for the benefit of others who may be watching, the previously reliable intuitions often leave the stock purchaser with egg on the face. Why do these experiences occur? Are those who are guided by their intuitions simply lucky from time to time? Or is there something else going on that is very real but simultaneously very misunderstood by mainstream modern science?

To complicate matters, there have been many examples throughout the ages of charlatans who have taken advantage of others by claiming that they have strange and powerful psychic capabilities. Some of these charlatans have been skilled in the art of magic tricks, and some have even purposely attempted to mislead scientists who are conducting honest investigations into psychic phenomena. Indeed, some have done this precisely to discredit the investigation of such phenomena. The problem of the charlatans (variously defined) has led to a broad cultural bias in our human society in which authentic scientific investigation into the realm of psychic phenomena is strongly discouraged. Probably the single most important factor in explaining the relative scarcity of scientists willing to investigate the psi realm is the fear of professional ridicule.

Given such territory, why should scientists risk their reputations on a phenomenon that has seemed so difficult to demonstrate "on-demand," and in an arena in which scientific investigations can be threatened by the skills of tricksters? Why also should other scientists believe the claims of their few

colleagues who do run the risk of professional criticism by conducting psi experiments? The fear of guilt by association is strong and has found parallels even in ancient texts, such as St. Peter's famous denial of his mentor.

To proceed further, we need to suspend the factor of fear and to maintain open minds. If remote viewing is to be demonstrated as a real phenomenon, then we must treat it as we would treat any other scientific puzzle. We must fear neither the charlatans nor our scientific colleagues who might denounce us. If remote viewing is a real phenomenon, no amount of denunciation will make it otherwise. There are puzzles to unravel for sure. Psi phenomena in general depend significantly on subjective perceptions. The fact that this subjectivity does not blend easily with laboratories filled with precision equipment of the type used to measure merely physical phenomena should not dissuade us from conquering the challenges that do exist. Indeed, there are ways to make the study of psi more objective, a point argued forcefully and by example throughout this volume.

What we have not yet fully accepted as a society is that we already have a physical device that can be utilized in laboratory settings to investigate psi phenomena generally, and remote viewing in particular. This physical device is the human nervous system. Our difficulty to date has been caused by our failure to understand how to use this device properly. This book seeks to advance our understanding of the human nervous system and its interaction with psi phenomena.

The History of Remote Viewing

Remote viewing has been a focus of research for many decades. For example, some of the earliest research directly relevant to this volume was published in 1948 by René Warcollier, which includes a detailed report of individuals who attempted to mentally transmit images and other thoughts from one person to another (Warcollier, 2001). A separate application of this same type of idea was published in 1951 by Sir Hubert Wilkins and Harold M. Sherman involving a riveting account of thoughts and images conveyed between individuals separated by thousands of miles (Wilkins and Sherman 2004). Montague Ullman, Stanley Krippner, and Alan Vaughan extended this theme in 1973 by working with thought transference involving nocturnal experiments with dreams (Ullman, Krippner, and Vaughan, 2002). More directly applicable to the current volume, Charles T. Tart, Harold E. Puthoff, and Russell Targ edited a seminal volume of research published in 1979 that details the results of various investigations into psi phenomena generally and remote viewing more specifically occurring both in the United States and abroad (Tart, Puthoff, and Targ, 2002).

The work presented in this volume follows most clearly from a recent history of research that dates back to the 1970s. At Stanford Research Institute (now SRI International), a remote viewing laboratory run by luminaries such as

Harold E. Puthoff, Russell Targ, and Edwin C. May, produced some remarkable results involving a number of early remote-viewing test participants. Some of these test participants developed their own remote-viewing methodologies that complemented their intuitive capabilities. Big breakthroughs occurred with talented viewers such as Pat Price, Ingo Swann, and Joe McMoneagle. These viewers developed histories of making amazingly accurate remote-viewing descriptions of locations and events that were otherwise unknown to them. After the remote-viewing lab at SRI International closed in 1989, Dr. May moved the program to Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC).

The U.S. government [through the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) and to some extent the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)] funded some of the early research into remote viewing (see especially Puthoff 1996). But proper funding was always an issue of contention between the principal scientists and their sponsors. It was clear from the beginning that advances in this field would come only after a great deal of research into the basic science of the phenomenon. But the government's primary interest in the phenomenon was operational in nature. The government wanted to know if remote viewing could be useful as a data gathering procedure for espionage. The government was also worried that a Soviet/US "remote-viewing gap" could emerge if research was abandoned entirely. The pressures to make remote viewing quickly operational as an espionage methodology led to inadequate funding tied to short-term projects subject to regular evaluations. A good description of the funding tensions in this regard can be found in a report by Kress (1999), a CIA operative with first-hand knowledge of these matters. This report was published in the *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, currently one of the most important publication outlets for research dealing with remote viewing. Indeed, the *Journal* dedicated an entire issue (1996, Vol. 10, Spring) to an evaluation of the early remote-viewing research, an issue that contains remarkable historical and analytical information written by many of the original investigators as well as others.

A careful reading of the extant literature relating to remote viewing suggests that remote viewing is a real phenomenon, albeit fickle. It has sometimes been used to produce remarkable results, while at other times there have been problems. This has left remote-viewing researchers in a state in which they know that the phenomenon is real, but they are unable to demonstrate this adequately to a skeptical audience that looks at apparent inconsistencies not as evidence of puzzles yet to solve, but as proof that the phenomenon itself is nonexistent (see especially the debate between Utts 1996 and Hyman 1996).

I decided to write the current volume when I became convinced that recent research conducted at The Farsight Institute filled some of the gaps in our understanding of remote viewing. Although I present the Institute's research and findings here as new, none of this work could have been accomplished in the absence of pioneering research done elsewhere by participants in this field who were more attracted to the possibility of scientific discovery than they were

afraid of scorn from their scientist colleagues.

My Own Background in Remote Viewing

My personal and scholarly interest in the subject of consciousness began when I learned the Transcendental Meditation (TM) technique. TM is a mechanical process designed to relieve stress and produce a heightened state of awareness. It is not, as is commonly misperceived, attached to any particular belief system. For me the TM experience proved to be a profound one, especially as I progressed through the more advanced TM-Sidhi Program, and the practice of TM remains an integral part of my daily life. Along the way, it also indirectly nurtured my growing interest in and desire to explore consciousness in general, and remote viewing in particular. In addition to TM, I also gained a valuable exposure to alternative approaches to the exploration of consciousness at The Monroe Institute, an institution established in Faber, Virginia by the late Robert Monroe who was deeply impressed early in his life with personal experiences that he described as having “out of body” characteristics.

My initial experience with remote viewing began in the early 1990s with a limited exposure to a basic version of CRV that had been renamed by a former military remote viewer. The more I practiced and studied remote viewing, including the examination of other remote viewing methods — some of which were used by a variety of mostly former military remote viewers, the more convinced I was that this is a very real and potentially significant phenomenon that deserved a wider forum among scholars, scientists, and the general public. Unfortunately, obtaining that wider forum beyond the narrow set of researchers who study parapsychology was and still is a difficult proposition. The relative absence or obscurity of scientific research on remote viewing that is published in mainstream outlets meant that the intellectual establishment looked upon the subject with a great deal of skepticism. That dominant view also controlled public opinion, to the extent that the general public was even aware of the subject.

Nevertheless, I felt compelled to communicate what I had learned, even though my conclusions remained necessarily tentative and hypothetical at that stage. My hope, of course, was to promote greater awareness of and research into remote viewing, and it was certainly not to promote myself as some kind of definitive authority or guru. (Actually, my experiences with this phenomenon have encouraged within myself a much greater rather than lesser degree of humility.) I realized, however, that my research and knowledge at that time had not progressed far enough for me to produce a formal scientific study that would be accepted in the academic world. And so I pressed on with the research.

Serendipitously, perhaps, my work in this area happened to converge with another growing interest of mine — the search for extraterrestrial life. Long the domain of astronomers (including the much-publicized SETI program), that

subject has unfortunately also attracted a variety of crackpots and cult figures over the ages. The latter, sad to say, have been visible enough to undermine the more legitimate efforts to investigate the possibilities of other life forms in our solar neighborhood and beyond. So, perhaps my decision to link my remote viewing and extraterrestrial interests was not a safely conservative choice as seen from an academic point of view. But when I research anything, it is my nature to write down my experiences in an on-going fashion, and I prefer to publish records of my work as markers of my own intellectual development rather than to file them in dust-covered cabinets.

Pursuing these twin interests, I wrote and published *Cosmic Voyage* — a work of speculative nonfiction. All remote-viewing data are speculative in nature when they are recorded. Such data can sometimes be profoundly accurate, but one can never know this until the data are compared with the known facts about the target for each remote-viewing session. In laboratory situations involving basic science experiments, the target for a remote-viewing session can often be known in just minutes, and the remote-viewing data can be evaluated with respect to accuracy right away. But with esoteric applications of remote viewing, the data must remain only speculative for however long it takes to obtain verification of the data with respect to the targets. Thus, remote-viewing data can by themselves never prove that something exists. However, such data collected by a remote viewer who has a proven track record with respect to accuracy can be of sufficient interest to warrant the expenditure of significant resources to learn if the data are indeed correct. But until that happens, the data are only speculative no matter who the remote viewer may happen to be.

As it turned out, and perhaps predictably, *Cosmic Voyage* was a popular success, although it did not significantly impact the academic establishment. That was followed by my second book on the subject of remote viewing, *Cosmic Explorers*. While this new book also delved into matters pertaining to extraterrestrial life, it marked a significant advance in my knowledge of the phenomenon and practice of remote viewing, which I think is where its primary contribution resides. Again, in terms of their extraterrestrial content, both of these books were written as speculative nonfiction, and I look hopefully forward to a day in which there may be an ability to obtain verification one way or the other for some of the data presented. Until such verification is obtained, the books should probably be loosely described as-yet unproven “hypotheses” based on my own perceptions. As a matter of interest, I might also add that I am not the only remote viewer who has published remote-viewing data relating to the subject of extraterrestrial life. (In particular, see McMoneagle 1993, pp. 155-174; Swann 1998.)

Both books, of course, clearly chart the development and evolution of SRV as a methodology. Despite the interest in remote viewing sparked by *Cosmic Voyage*, after its publication I remained uncomfortable with the basic remote-

viewing methodology to which I had originally been exposed. I felt there were inconsistencies and some incoherence in its structure and application, even though it seemed to work fairly well as a basic data-gathering tool. I felt the procedures could be improved, but I needed a space (a “laboratory” in effect) where I could pursue improvements in a much more focused and deliberative fashion. Other psi laboratories existed (and still exist), such as the University of Amsterdam Anomalous Cognition Group, The Boundary Institute, The Cognitive Sciences Laboratory, Consciousness Research Laboratory, Koestler Parapsychology Lab (University of Edinburgh), Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research, Rhine Research Center (Institute for Parapsychology), and James Spottiswoode and Associates. But these other prestigious laboratories and gifted researchers tended to work on a variety of diverse approaches to psi phenomena, generally following the interests of the principal researchers involved. As important as these other approaches were (and remain), I wanted to pursue a different orientation by working with a limited set of remote-viewing procedures, allowing the procedures to evolve incrementally as a consequence of experimentation, trial and error. The space needed to do this, once secured through the creation of The Farsight Institute, provided the foundation for continued research into the SRV methodology and the remote-viewing phenomenon.

In its early years, the Institute provided an infrastructure for research, as well as instruction for many individuals who were interested in learning more about the remote-viewing phenomenon. Courses conducted at the Institute did not focus on the extraterrestrial question, although a few students happened to share my personal interest in that controversial subject. Instead, the sole mission of the courses was to provide a basic introduction to remote viewing.

As our research and teaching progressed, SRV continued to evolve away from its CRV roots, always based on changes that were the result of a great deal of trial and error. Yet I was concerned that we might never be able to reach a wide public audience if we continued to teach only small groups. It was due to this concern that I decided to publish a complete text for Scientific Remote Viewing that has been freely available on the Institute’s web site since 1997. We have continued to expand our (now very large) library of free instructional materials ever since. I have never taken any financial compensation from The Farsight Institute, so all of our financial resources were plowed back into training an expanding and increasingly talented group of remote viewers as well as research into the basic science of the remote-viewing phenomenon. This was a period of significant growth for The Farsight Institute.

I should also mention that a number of other very capable remote-viewing instructors and organizations emerged during this period as well, and they too were evolving and improving their own methodologies and approaches in new and interesting ways. For example, Glenn B. Wheaton, a talented instructor and former military remote viewer, founded the Hawaii Remote Viewers’ Guild

(www.hrvg.org), an energetic group which has remained both active and highly productive. Also, I have long admired the careful development work and educational efforts of Lyn Buchanan (www.crviewer.com), a former military remote viewer with solid educational instincts. F. Holmes “Skip” Atwater, another former military remote viewer, has additionally made very significant advances while working at The Monroe Institute (www.monroeinstitute.org) in the development and application of sound technologies that enable and/or enhance the remote-viewing experience. I have also heard positive reports from students of Paul Smith, yet another former military remote viewer. More recently, a number of people who began their training at The Farsight Institute and elsewhere have emerged as creative innovators and instructors of their own evolving versions of remote-viewing methodologies. Still others (some former military and some not) have also begun to make methodological and instructional contributions in this rapidly expanding field.

As time passed and the initial public interest in remote viewing seemed to subside, we used some quiet years at The Farsight Institute to design and execute a lengthy series of experiments that would allow us to better understand what we considered to be a few puzzling yet crucial aspects of the remote-viewing phenomenon. All of our experiments involved basic science questions relating to the remote-viewing phenomenon itself, rather than applied or esoteric topics such as extraterrestrial life. Simply, we wanted to find out more about why remote viewing actually worked, and how to make it work better. This volume is a report of our findings.

How to Place the Contribution of this Book

All investigators have their own approaches to the way they think research should be conducted, and many passionately defend these approaches. One need only look at the blistering review by Hansen, Utts, and Markwick (1992) of remote-viewing experiments conducted at the Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research (PEAR) program to see just how passionate these opinions on how to conduct research in this field can be held. It is not my intent to side with past debates regarding programs or approaches, but I do want to make a case for why people should consider the results presented in this volume seriously regardless of how individual psi researchers may want to conduct their own experiments.

Most psi laboratories are run by scientists who are not typically subjects of their own experiments. That is, these scientists find others to act as subjects in their experiments. The scientists themselves are trained in the scientific method, statistics, experimental design, and so forth. But they are usually not highly trained users of psi. In the case of remote viewing, the scientists often work with remote-viewing subjects of various capabilities, from stellar professionals like Joe McMoneagle to ordinary college students who have had no previous training. But the scientists themselves typically do not publish papers about their

own attempts at remote viewing.

After years of reading scientific papers of psi phenomena in general, and remote viewing in particular, I began to sense that there was sometimes a disparity between the way many researchers set-up and conducted their remote-viewing experiments and the experience of remote viewing itself that I — and others with whom I have worked — have had. For example, in a report by May, Utts, Humphrey, Luke, Frivold, and Trask (1990), they present an interesting and original approach to analyzing remote-viewing data using a fuzzy set coding scheme. In this report, they code targets drawn from pictures from *National Geographic Magazine*. But as part of their approach, they define these targets to be exactly what is in each picture, *and nothing except what is in each picture*. Quoting from the article, “Implied visual importance was ignored. For example, in a photograph of the Grand Canyon that did not show the Colorado River, water, river, and so on would be scored as zero. By definition the target was only what was visible in the photograph” (May, et. al., 1990, p. 200). From the perspective of trying to limit the target definition to only that which is definitively known, this seems at first glance like a reasonable scoring procedure. But it is generally recognized by many remote viewers with whom I have worked that remote-viewing data are not limited to that which may be visible in a target photograph. Indeed, a target photograph tends to locate a viewer at a specific location, but the viewer is then free to perceive (or fail to perceive) anything that is at that location, and it is hard to imagine a situation in which a viewer would be *expected* to miss the Colorado River if the target was the Grand Canyon. Any scheme that fails to take into account this apparently inescapable reality of the remote-viewing phenomenon seems — from an experiential point of view — to be trying to bend the phenomenon to meet the scientific method rather than adapting the scientific method to match the parameters of the phenomenon.

As another and similar example, I once saw a report of a remote-viewing session (not one reported by May or his colleagues) that was scored as a miss when the viewer failed to perceive the vegetables on a plate that constituted the target. The session in fact gave a good description of the house and people that surrounded the vegetables, but alas, the vegetables were not in the data. Again, I saw this as an example of how the analytical methods used did not match the reality of the remote-viewing phenomenon. (I discuss in more detail the problems associated with this type of “embedded” target in the appendix to this volume.)

Another (and more important) example of how a commonly applied element of the scientific method conflicts with characteristics of the remote-viewing phenomenon itself is with what has become a standard experimental set-up for many researchers. In this set-up, comparisons are made between remote-viewing data and a set of potential targets, one real and the others decoys. The set-up normally uses five potential targets, and judges are used to make the

comparisons between the possible targets and the remote-viewing data to see how well the remote viewer describes the real target. (The set-up to which I am referring does not utilize an “outbinder” in the data collection process, a term which I describe later in this volume.) Much of this volume is dedicated to explaining a nearly obsessive series of experiments that we ran at The Farsight Institute to understand what is in fact going on with this procedure, and our conclusion finds that the procedure itself deeply conflicts with the psychic targeting process of remote viewing, leading to the near total corruption of the data-gathering process. The reason underlying this conclusion is not simple, and I ask readers to hold off on their judgment of these statements until they have read the remaining chapters in this volume. Our initial suspicions regarding the “pick the correct target out of the bunch” idea came because of our own personal experiences with this procedure. Certain phenomena occur when this procedure is used, and the phenomena are so repeatable that we concluded that the fault was not with our remote-viewing capabilities, but rather with the experimental set-up. Speaking from a personal level, I am a scientist who has invested years learning how to remote view, and repeated remote-viewing experiences have taught me to trust that these experiences are real. Something was happening with the “pick the correct target out of a bunch” experimental set-up that made my own remote-viewing experience go awry, and it was because of my long experience as a remote viewer that I decided to question how elements of this routinely used experimental design might influence the remote-viewing experience in an unexpected fashion.

The fundamental substance of this volume delves into the problem of defining what makes a target a target. That is, why should a remote viewer perceive one place or location rather than another? Is it because a picture of a place was put in an envelope that the remote viewer will be given after a session is completed? Is it because someone will eventually analyze the remote-viewing data with respect to a particular target? Is it because someone chooses a picture and tacks a set of remote-viewing “coordinate numbers” on it? Is it because a computer randomly picks a target out of a pool of targets? The question of what makes a target work with respect to remote viewing is obviously an important one, and any potential answer to this question deserves to have a hearing. But this volume does not present a “cookie-cutter” collection of experiments with a twist. Our approach to investigating the remote-viewing phenomenon is different from much of what has been reported elsewhere, and it is within that differentness that the true value of the contribution of this volume can be found.

This is an exploratory volume that presents research conducted by remote viewers. In constructing the experiments presented here, we consciously tried not to stop ourselves from questioning some things that other scientists were doing when their procedures or experimental conditions seemed to conflict with our experience of the remote-viewing phenomenon. We have designed our experiments such that they find correspondence with the years of our own

remote-viewing experiences. That is, in my attempt to answer the questions that I raise in this volume, I have tried to maintain as delicate a balance as possible between my role as a scientist and my role as a remote viewer. As a result, the information presented in the pages that follow is the result of a different internal dynamic than that which sometimes occurs in other remote-viewing laboratories. This is not a study conducted by scientists who observe how others remote view. Rather, this is a scientific study of remote viewing that has been guided by the personal remote-viewing experiences of the researchers themselves.

It is important to understand that I am not criticizing other remote-viewing laboratories. I think any reader of this volume will see that I have obviously gained tremendously from the reports that these laboratories and their associated researchers have issued over that past few decades. Rather, I am arguing that the efforts presented in these pages can add to the public dialogue regarding the remote-viewing phenomenon precisely because of the differentness of these efforts. It is certainly true that I deeply desire for other remote-viewing laboratories to attempt to test and/or replicate the findings presented in this volume. Indeed, I am counting on this to happen. Moreover, I fully expect that other remote-viewing researchers will add their own approaches and methods to their tests of our findings. If some researchers disagree with a particular procedure or set of controls that we have used and reported in these pages, then these same researchers will certainly make the changes that they find appropriate when they conduct their own experiments. But in the end, I feel certain that if the fundamental ideas presented here are tested honestly in an uncompromising fashion, these same researchers will find that the primary results presented in this volume are indeed correct.

This is not the “definitive” volume of remote-viewing research, and a definitive work may not even be possible in such a rapidly evolving field. Rather, these are a collection of ideas and experimental results. Here we have not eschewed the scientific method, by any means. But we have tried not to let certain practices that have been accepted as routine elsewhere confine our ability to investigate the compatibility of these practices with the reality of the remote-viewing phenomenon as we have experienced it. I ask not that anyone accept the findings presented here with blind faith. But I do ask that researchers consider the possibility that what is presented in these pages is correct, and that the modifications suggested here to the way many think about and study the remote-viewing phenomenon may be justified. Indeed, I am asking only that readers have an open mind and consider without prejudicing bias the possibilities that I present below.

The Structure of this Research

In chapter 2 of this volume I present the basic theory of remote viewing as it is

researched at The Farsight Institute. This is not a detailed description of the mechanics of the basic SRV process, which is available elsewhere (Brown 1999, and for free at www.farsight.org). Chapter 2 presents a theoretical overview of the remote-viewing process itself, together with an explanation of the “subspace hypothesis” which is central to all of the discussions in this volume.

Chapters 3 through 5 each address a specific process-related research question regarding the remote-viewing phenomenon using data collected at The Farsight Institute. A particular empirical test has been used for decades to evaluate the descriptive accuracy of remote viewing. In this test, remote-viewing data are compared with a short list of possible targets, one real and the rest decoys. Curious phenomena have occurred when using this procedure which have left raging debates in this field. Chapter 3 presents results that address this controversy. The bottom line is that the evaluative methodology seems to interfere with the delicate mental remote-viewing process. Fixing the experimental design fixes the problem, and repaired experiments morph in the direction of profundity.

A number of experiments conducted at The Farsight Institute allowed us to probe the structure of time, which is the subject of chapter 4. The questions addressed revolve around what truly is the beginning of anything. The results of these experiments and others that are presented in this volume stretch our understanding of reality.

Chapter 5 presents results of an experiment which tests a potential problem inherent with experimental psi methods in which subjects are asked to obtain remote-viewing perceptions repeatedly in order to amass sample sizes large enough for statistical evaluations of psi functioning. In this experiment, controls are used to avoid the potential for contamination of psi phenomena via the thought processes of human analysts. To accomplish this, a computer program and system are used to evaluate the remote-viewing data and completely eliminate the threatening contamination. The results of the experiment suggest that the process of remote viewing batches of targets can potentially destroy the psychic targeting mechanism of remote viewing.

For approximately six months, The Farsight Institute sponsored a public demonstration of Scientific Remote Viewing on its web site, www.farsight.org. The demonstration was fascinating from at least two points of view. First, clear and solid scientific controls were maintained throughout the demonstration, and literally thousands of individuals from all over the world both watched and participated in the process. Targets were chosen by an outside person of significant reputation, and the results were verified by literally everyone watching. The second point of intense fascination was that we dovetailed our public demonstration project with an experimental design involving future time. All of this is presented in chapter 6.

Chapter 7 is where I more fully explain the underlying mechanism that determines how and why a remote viewer maintains a perceptual focus on a

specific target. Also in this chapter, I explain why the role of uncertainty in the remote-viewing process further complicates the targeting mechanism and perceptual focus of the remote viewer. Figures with visual approximations of mentally accessed visual imagery are also presented.

For remote viewing to be fully accepted within the scientific community as a real phenomenon, it will be important to explain how it could be possible from the perspective of theoretical physics. Cosmological, relativistic, and quantum physics do not yet have fully developed theories that can explain how the remote-viewing phenomenon might occur. Modifications to the way we understand physical reality will be necessary for us to place remote viewing within a proper scientific context. This does not mean that remote viewing is impossible, for clearly it is possible, as I believe any reasonably unbiased reader will conclude after examining the extant field closely. Rather, it means that our theories of the physical universe need to change in order to allow for the remote-viewing phenomenon. In chapter 8, I outline a theory of physical and nonphysical reality that corresponds with the nature of the remote-viewing experience, and this discussion is aimed at assisting physicists and cosmologists who work with such theories.

I develop in chapter 9 some additional theory regarding consciousness, and discuss the profound philosophical implications of this research to our understanding of physical reality and the human condition. I also further address the broader issues of time and its implications with regard to free will.

To perform remote viewing, one has to acquire the skill of having a truly open mind, in the full spiritual sense. To understand remote viewing and its implications intellectually, one needs to have an open mind of a different sort. This is the challenge to the reader: maintain an open mind while considering the data, analyses, and interpretations offered here. One is always free to reject an idea once it is considered fully. But if one never gives the idea a chance by rejecting the possibilities in the idea, who is the loser, the idea or the mind?

We live in a universe of change. History has demonstrated that nothing changes more profoundly in this universe than the ideas we have about it. We are more of an open society than we previously could have imagined. No mind is a truly closed system, however privately sealed to the universe it may consider itself. We live in a time in which we can show that consciousness is not limited to our physiology. We live in a time in which we may be able to know that consciousness is more than private thought. In a very real sense, consciousness *is* an open mind, a mind of expanding boundaries with as yet undetermined limits.

Index

Abbott, E., 22
Aczel, A., 238, 239, 252
Advanced SRV, 34, 293, 294
alternate realities, 220
analyst, 44-50, 53-62, 70, 72-75, 78, 96, 98, 112, 114-116, 124, 129, 140, 146,
199-201, 203, 204, 206-209, 211, 212, 214
anomalous cognition, 3, 12, 85, 95
Arendt, H., 283
assumptive focus, 200, 201, 211, 212, 214
Atwater, S., 13
Barrow, J. 220
base-10 to binary, 10, 56, 60, 119
Basic SRV, 17, 34, 293, 294
Bem, D., 271
Bierman, D., 85
Blakeslee, S., 42
blind, xx, 2, 3, 16, 33, 46, 47, 49, 52, 59, 60, 74, 78, 96, 114, 115, 209, 211,
234, 237, 250, 276, 293
Bohr, N., 232
Born, M., 85, 254, 270
brain, 1, 20, 24, 25, 42, 43, 72, 95, 237-239, 241, 269-271, 273-275
Braud, W., 199
Brinkley, D., 275
Brown, C., 3, 4, 17, 31, 41, 58, 76, 81-84, 91, 143, 144, 147, 155, 211, 213
Buchanan, L., 13
Buddhism, 278
Cabalism, 278
catastrophe, 95, 201, 202, 211-214, 242
catastrophe theory, 95, 202, 211, 212
cave allegory, 283
Central Intelligence Agency, 9
chaos, 241
Cognitive Sciences Laboratory, 12
complexity, xxv, 22, 32, 242, 266
Confessions, 277, 279
conscious mind, 22, 26-28, 30, 32-36, 38, 41, 58, 112, 115, 117, 142, 163, 287
Consciousness Research Laboratory, 12
coordinates, 32-34, 36, 52, 296
Corinthians, 278

- Cosmic Explorers*, 11, 23
Cosmic Voyage, 11, 22, 23
 cross-cutting psi channels, 7, 51, 78, 146, 156, 165, 200, 204, 208, 214, 234, 235, 259, 261, 267
 CRV (Controlled Remote Viewing), xvi, 3, 4, 10, 12, 126, 127
 Davies, P., 231
 decoding, 35-37, 40, 41, 43, 62, 77, 114, 158, 159, 161, 163, 165-167, 171, 176, 187, 194, 272, 294
 Defense Intelligence Agency, 9
 Dervishes, 278
 differential equations, 89, 212, 247
 directional field, 11, 91, 92
 Dobyns, Y., 57, 112, 113
 doubt, xviii, xxiv, 2, 6, 7, 27, 111, 119, 139, 181, 216, 267, 287
 Duune, B., 57, 112, 113
 Dunne, J., 85
 Duval, M., xvii
 Eadie, B., 275
 eidetic reduction, 273
 Einstein, A., 85, 217, 237, 242, 256, 259, 266, 267
 EMS modeling, 242
 energy, 38, 39, 64, 65, 87, 88, 92-94, 161, 180, 220, 221, 236, 238, 256, 262, 276, 294
 Enhanced SRV, 34, 293, 294
 entanglement, xviii, 6, 51, 219, 234, 236-241
 equilibrium, 91, 200, 214
 equilibrium marsh, 91
 ERV (Enhanced Remote Viewing), 3, 4
 ether, 217, 218
 Everett, H., 231
 evolution, 11, 74, 92-94, 258, 263, 281, 283
 exact mathematical specification modeling, 242
 experiential cosmology, 9, 215-217
 experimental conditions, 7, 10, 15, 31, 45, 48, 49, 97
 Faith, L., 16, 118, 125, 138, 141
 feedback, 44, 48, 50, 96, 116, 240
 Ferrari, D.
 Flatland, 22
 Floyd Bennet, 172, 173, 176, 184
 fractal, 242
 Frivold, T., 14, 113
 game theory, 242
 Goswami, A., 27, 241

- Grand Canyon, 14
 Greville, T., 70
 Grof, S., 20
 Hameroff, S., 24, 95, 241
 Hansen, G., 13
 Harary, K., 52, 57, 72
 harmonic oscillators, 247
 Hawaii Remote Viewers' Guild (HRVG), xvi, 3, 12, 13, 32, 126, 127
 Hawking, S., 216, 218, 228, 262
 Heidegger, M., 274
 Hekaloth, 278
 Hinduism, 278
 Hirsh, M., 88, 89
 Holotropic Breathwork, 20, 21
 Honorton, C., 85, 271
 Houtkooper, J., 70
 Humphrey, B., 14, 113
 Husserl, E., 273, 274
 Hyman, R., 9, 53, 128
 hyperspace, 20-23, 201, 222, 223, 225-227, 235, 236, 244-248, 301
 hypersurface, 21, 22, 227, 236, 246-248, 250
 hypnagogia, 276
 ideogram, 35-38, 40
 Institute for Parapsychology, 12
 interface, 7, 24-26, 28-31, 33, 35, 36, 40, 55, 94, 95, 104, 114, 115, 130, 172, 191, 202, 237-239, 269, 273, 274, 277, 278, 280
 invariant, 274
 Islam, 278
 Jahn, R., 53, 57, 112, 113
 James, C., 58, 62, 85, 118, 141, 281
 John (Apostle), 277, 278, 290
 Josephson, B., 241
Journal of Scientific Exploration, 9
Journal of Transpersonal Psychology, 20
 Judaism, 278
 Jung, C., 20
 Kaku, M., 21
 Koçak, H., 89, 247
 Koestler Parapsychology Lab, 12
 Kress, K., 9, 73, 219
 Krippner, S., 8
 Lantz, N., 58
 Lissajous figure, 12, 247-249, 252, 255, 264

loop quantum gravity, 215, 221, 257
 Lotka, 89, 242
 lottery, 8, 47-49, 53, 56, 57, 59-61, 63, 80, 86, 111, 117-124, 145
 low-bandwidth, 7, 24-26, 31, 274
 low-level information, 37
 Luke, W., 14, 58, 113
 Mach, E., 85, 86
 Markwick, B., 13
 mathematical modeling, 241, 242
 Mavromatis, A., 276
 May, E., 9, 14, 51, 58, 62, 85, 113, 114, 118, 141, 281
 maya, 27
 McMoneagle, J., 3, 9, 11, 13, 45, 74, 85, 126, 275
 meditation, 3, 10, 26, 28, 30, 118, 122
 Merkabah, 278
 meta-analysis, 85, 125
 Michelson-Morley experiment, 217, 218
 Mishlove, J., 21
 monitor, 31-33, 45, 46, 49, 57, 237, 287, 293, 295
 Monroe Institute, 10, 13
 Moody, R. 275
 Morse, M., 275
 Mt. Vesuvius, 8, 176, 177, 184
 Myers, F., 275
National Geographic Magazine, 14
 near-death experience (NDE), 275
 Nelson, R., 57, 72, 112, 113
 nervous system, 5, 8, 24
 Newtonian, 85-87, 91, 269
 nonlocal, 6, 19, 27, 269
 nonphysical, 3-6, 18-23, 55, 216, 241, 267, 269-271, 275, 276, 278
 nonphysical aspect, 5, 6
 orchestrated objective reduction, 95
 original consciousness, 273
 out-of-body, 20, 275-277, 279
 out-of-body experience, 275, 279
 Paul (Saint) 278
 PEAR, 3, 13, 113
 Penrose, R., 24, 95, 216, 241, 262
 perceptual focus, 9, 17, 18, 36, 96, 97, 199-201, 211, 212, 214, 296
 Perry (explorer), 174
 Perry, P., 275
 Phase 1, 34-37, 40, 296

- Phase 2, 35, 40, 160, 161, 172, 176, 179, 294, 296
- Phase 3, 35, 40, 296
- Phase 4, 35, 40, 132, 161, 293, 294, 296
- Phase 5, 35, 296
- phase diagram, 11, 92, 214
- phase energy, 92-94
- phase portrait, 91
- phase space, 75, 76, 91-95, 267
- phenomenological reduction, 273
- physical/subspace interface, 24-26, 28-31, 33, 35, 36, 40, 94, 95, 104, 202, 237-239, 273, 274, 277, 278, 280
- physics, xv, xviii, 5, 6, 18, 89, 215, 217-219, 221, 226-228, 230, 231, 237, 239, 242, 266, 267, 269, 270
- Plato, 283
- Poincare lives, 264
- Poincare map, 248, 249, 264
- Pompeii, 11, 176-178, 184
- precognition, 85, 301
- predator-prey, 89, 90, 218, 242
- Price, P., 9, 73
- Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research (PEAR), 12, 13, 113
- probing, 36, 37, 293
- probing the ideogram, 36, 37
- process, 6
- proof, 6
- pseudo body, 276
- psychic bubble, 52, 53
- psychology, 9, xv, 20, 21, 269, 271, 272, 274, 276, 282
- Puthoff, H., 8, 9, 51, 72, 73
- quantum collapse, 95
- quantum decoherence, 231
- quantum step size, 221, 223, 225
- Radin, D., 85, 125, 281
- Ramana Maharshi, 27
- rational choice theory, 242
- relativity, 9, 85, 103, 215, 242, 262, 282
- relativity theory, 262
- Republic (Plato), 283
- Revelations (Bible), 277
- Rhine Research Center, 12
- Rossner, J., xviii, 272
- Russell, J., xviii, 150, 153, 194, 262, 263
- Russell Procedure, 9, 116, 149, 187, 188

- Sagan, C., 13
 Schmidt, S., 70
 Schnabel, J., 73
 Schrödinger, E., 27
 Schwartz, G., 275
 Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) 3, 9, 31, 44, 51, 53
 Scientific Remote Viewing (SRV) 7, 8, 3-5, 12, 17, 44, 48, 56, 271, 294, 296
 senses, 13, 5-7, 19, 24-26, 35, 43, 235, 262, 264, 269, 271, 279, 296
 sequential simultaneity, 89, 91, 95, 104, 105, 277
 SETI, 10
 Sherman, H., 8
 Shih, Y., 239, 240
 Sirag, S., 21
 Smale, S., 88, 89
 Smith, P., 13
 Smolin, L., 218, 221
 soul, 1, 5, 6, 23, 55, 270, 274-277, 280, 283
 Spottiswoode, J., 12, 58, 62, 85, 118, 141, 281
 SRI International, 3, 4, 8, 9, 31, 44, 51-53
 St. Augustine, 277, 279
 Stanford Research Institute (SRI International) 8, 52
 Stapp, H., 241
 statistical modeling, 241, 242
 Stein, A., 125
 String theory, 215, 216, 246
 subspace, 7, 9, 17, 19, 22-36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 55, 74, 77, 86, 94, 95, 104, 112,
 146, 199, 202, 226, 227, 237-239, 244-246, 248, 251, 252,
 269-280, 283, 296
 subspace aspect, 23, 24, 55, 74, 202, 237, 270-272, 274-279
 subspace mind, 32, 34-36, 41, 55, 77, 112, 269, 270
 subspace psychology, 9, 271, 274, 276
 Sufism, 278
 sutra, 27
 Swann, I., 4, 9, 11, 74
 switched session, 127
 Targ, R., 8, 9, 51, 52, 72, 73
 tasker, 32-34, 45-50, 72, 80, 95, 135, 136, 143, 216, 219, 236, 280, 285-290,
 293, 297
 tasking, 33, 34, 47, 49, 86, 95-101, 103, 105, 126, 138, 139, 181, 216, 217, 219,
 236, 285, 286, 293, 297
 terrorist attack, 219
 test determinant, 47-50, 96
 The Boundary Institute, 12

The Spectrum of Consciousness, 26
Thom, R., 76, 95, 213
Tiller, W., 241
Timm, U., 70
TM-Sidhi Program, 10, 26, 118
trajectory, 75-77, 91, 92, 267
Transcendental Meditation (TM) 10, 26
transcendental reduction, 274
transpersonal bands, 20, 21, 23
transpersonal psychology, 20, 21
Trask, V., 14, 113
two-slit experiment, 9, 12, 219, 227, 228, 230-234, 236, 247, 259, 260, 266
Ullman, M., 8
uncertainty, 18, 202, 203, 220, 233
University of Amsterdam Anomalous Cognition Group, 12
Utts, J., 6, 9, 13, 14, 51, 57, 72, 73, 85, 113, 125-127, 281
Vaitl, D., 70
Vasiliev, L., 199
Vaughan, F., 8, 20
vector field, 91-93
Vedanta psychology, 20, 21
Vedantic sheath, 22
viewing condition, 49
Volterra, 89, 242
Walach, H., 70
Walsh, R., 20
Warcollier, R., 8
Watt, C., 118, 141
Wheaton, G., 12, 127
Wheeler, J., 232, 252
Wilber, K., 20, 21, 23, 26
Wilkins, H., 8
Wolf, F., 21, 226, 228, 231, 241
world lines, 9, 262, 263
Yuktswar, Sri, 27
Zeeman, E., 76, 213