

## Viewing the Future: A Pilot Study with an Error-Detecting Protocol

RUSSELL TARG, JANE KATRA, DEAN BROWN AND WENDEN WIEGAND<sup>1</sup>

*Bay Research Institute, 1010 Harriet Street, Palo Alto, CA 94301*

**Abstract** — This paper describes a precognition experiment in which two researchers took the part of viewers, and worked with two judges to design and implement an experiment in associative remote viewing. We used a redundant protocol to eliminate some of the problems experienced by many of us who have tried to harness *psi* for real world applications. We carried out nine weeks of remote viewing trials, in which the viewer was to describe the target that he or she would be shown two days in the future. At each trial the viewers had their own target pools of two targets about which they knew nothing. A total of 18 viewings were carried out at the rate of one per person per week. Targets were randomly assigned "up" or "down" status by the judges previous to the viewing. If the viewers both accurately described targets of discrepant directions, then the trial was considered a pass. Additionally, if a viewer's target description failed to be awarded a rating of 4 or more on a 0-7 point rating scale, his or her call was declared a pass. Of the 12 viewings that were not rated pass by the judges, 11 correctly described the object that the viewer was shown at a later time ( $p = 0.003$ ). The objects shown to each viewer corresponded to the direction of the one-day change in the price of May Silver futures. Of the nine trials carried out, two were passed for various reasons, and seven were recorded as traded in the market, although no purchases were actually made. Six of the seven trade forecasts were correct.

### Introduction

This participant-observer report describes the trial and error examination of the *psi* process in a group setting. The inspiration for our present research into *psi* abilities (extrasensory perception) derives from our continuing concern with the effects of consciousness on our relationship to space, and time, and to each other. Our purpose for publishing the detailed protocol is to encourage other researchers to replicate these simple and successful experiments.

The remote viewing protocol for eliciting psychic functioning has been investigated for more than twenty years, since it was first developed by Targ and Puthoff at Stanford Research Institute (SRI) in the early 1970's (Targ, 1974; Puthoff, 1976). Since our original publications of remote viewing (RV) studies, twenty-four attempted replications have been conducted, with more than half of these being reported as successful and statistically significant (Hansen,

---

<sup>1</sup>The authors wish to acknowledge the important contributions of Jeffrey Mishlove to the conceptualization and organization of this project.

1984). In 1982 we developed an extension of the remote viewing protocol that incorporated precognitive remote viewing. We made nine forecasts, four days in advance of changes in the price of silver futures on the COMEX commodity exchange. All nine predictions were correct, but for a variety of reasons, we were unable to replicate that success the following year (Harary, 1985). In these precognitive experiments, we are endeavoring to make a forecast about a future event that is unequivocally outside the control of any of the experimenters. This paper describes a different precognitive protocol than was previously used.

In this experiment, two viewers with separate target pools were used, to increase the reliability of applied psi by achieving error correcting redundancy. This work reflects a continuation of our concern with the often neglected issues of mutual trust and consensus of purpose in experimental psi, as described in the 1990 Parapsychology Association Conference panel on "Increasing Psychic Reliability," (Targ, 1991). Accuracy is often excellent, the goal here is to increase reliability.

### **What Do We Know about Remote Viewing?**

We have shown that remote viewers can often experience and describe hidden objects blocked from ordinary perception, or contact a remote natural or architectural site, based on some target demarcation that we call an address. Such demarcations have included the presence of a cooperative person at the location, or geographical coordinates. It has been found that it is not necessary for someone to know the correct answer at the time of the viewing. For example, in precognitive remote viewing, the target may not even be chosen at the time of the experimental trial. In the experiment described here, the viewers were shown the correct feedback at a later time, because the feedback is the putative source of the psi data. We have previously shown that feedback is not a prerequisite for successful real-time remote viewing (Targ, 1983).

One of the hallmarks of the remote viewing process is that shape, form and color are described much more reliably than the target's function, or other analytical information. In addition to visual imagery, viewers sometimes describe other sensory data such as associated feelings, sounds, smells and even electrical or magnetic fields. As a viewer, I (RT) have learned that if I see a color clearly and brightly, or something silver and shiny, then that is the aspect of the target which I am most likely to describe correctly. Several others have reported these unusual and personal responses to target data as well.

Viewers can sense both present and future activities at target sites. There is no evidence to indicate that it is more difficult to look slightly into the future, than it is to describe an object in a box in front of you. Blueprint accuracy can sometimes be achieved, and reliability in a series can be as high as 80% (May, 1995). Unlike card-guessing or other forced choice experiments, more than two decades of remote viewing research have shown no decline in performance. Quite the contrary, practice allows people to become increasingly

skillful in their ability to separate out the psychic signal from the mental noise of memory and imagination.

We have shown that accuracy and resolution of remote viewing targets are not sensitive to distance of up to 10,000 miles, as demonstrated in our trials with Djuna Davitashvili in the 1984 Moscow-San Francisco remote viewing (Targ, 1984). Targets and target details as small as 1 mm can be sensed. Hella Hammid successfully described 1 mm x 1 mm microscopic picture targets in an experimental series at SRI in 1979, and she once correctly identified a silver pin and a spool of thread inside an aluminum film can, as part of a successful ten-trial series with tiny objects (Puthoff, 1979).

Faraday-cage screen rooms and under-water shielding have no negative effects on remote viewing. In fact, some viewers prefer to work in an electrically shielded environment. The well known psychic Eileen Garrett used such a room that she had built for her own use, in her offices at the Parapsychology Foundation on 57th Street in New York City.

Visual or audio distractions, or anything novel in the working environment may appear as noise or erroneous impressions on the viewer's mental screen during the remote viewing session. Additionally, numbers are usually much more difficult to perceive than pictorial targets. It seems to be harder to guess a number from 1 to 10, than it is to describe a location chosen from an infinitude of planetary locations that one has never seen before. In looking for geographical targets, viewers search their interior mental landscape for a surprise, and this will usually be the correct answer. With a numerical target, there are no surprises since one is already familiar with all the possibilities, and is apt to try to use analysis to rule out the various choices. A prior knowledge of target possibilities, absence of feedback, and use of mental analysis all tend to make remote viewing more difficult.

Factors that enhance remote viewing are seriousness of purpose, feedback, heart-to-heart trust among all participants, and acceptance of *psi*. Experienced viewers learn to improve their performance by becoming aware of their own mental noise from memory and imagination, filtering it out, and by writing down their impressions and drawing their mental pictures. Drawing is especially important because it gives one direct access to his or her unconscious processes.

The use of several viewers can bring additional information of remote viewing targets. However, sometimes the viewers all describe the same wrong target. It was hypothesized that if individual viewers each had their own target set, the problem of redundant missing might be circumvented. The present experiment was designed to test this theory, as well as our idea that mutual trust among all experimental participants, and commonality of purpose are necessary prerequisites for reliability in *psi* experiments.

### **Experimental Protocol**

Our plan was to re-examine the "December Silver" experiments in remote

viewing carried out by Targ, White, and Harary in 1982. We were also influenced by the work of Puthoff, who carried out another associational remote viewing series of trials in 1984 to raise money for a school. He used several viewers in a majority vote approach, and was quite successful in more than thirty trials. (Puthoff, 1985).

In this experimental series no actual purchases were made, and the trials were at the rate of one per week. The viewer's task was to describe the object that they would be shown in two day's time. Each week on Sunday evening, both viewers made "up" or "down" forecasts for changes in the price of silver. If the viewers agreed on the direction of their forecasts, then a simulated order was placed Sunday night to buy or sell at the Monday opening. The forecasting was for the change in price for a contract of May Silver, from the time of the Monday opening to the close on the same day.

The protocol used two viewers, each describing objects that they would be shown on the following Tuesday evening. The percipients in this case were physicist Russell Targ and health educator Jane Katra, each of whom has extensive experience in *psi* research and other sciences as well. Our idea is that if we are to gain an understanding of the *psi* process, we should do it ourselves, rather than rely on passers-by to tell us about their experiences. For example, the biologist doing a critical experiment would not think of asking an inexperienced undergraduate to look through her microscope to collect the data. She would do it herself. In experimental science, that's how we discover what is going on.

For example, we shortened the time between our viewing period and the feedback session from four days to two days because we found it easier to describe a target shown to us two days in the future, than it was to describe one that we were shown four days in the future. The time frame presented psychological and subjective effects for us. By the time our feedback had been delayed by four days, we had somewhat forgotten what the process of describing the object during the viewing session had felt like to us. As a result, the feedback, which is hypothesized to be the source of that earlier perception, had less of an impact on the viewers at feedback time. Our experience was that our viewing was not as sharp as it had been for real-time remote viewing. The hypothesis here, of course, is that a later event is the cause of an earlier perception. Therefore, the strength of the emotional or sensory impact of the event is an important precursor of precognitive viewing success.

Each viewer had his or her own pair of objects in the target pool. For example, DB choose two objects for JK's viewing session, and WW choose two for RT. The objects were chosen in pairs, to be as orthogonal to each other in their various attributes as possible. On each Sunday evening DB interviewed RT (concerning targets selected by WW), and WW interviewed JK (concerning targets selected by DB) about their impressions of the object that they were to be shown on the following Tuesday evening.

We know that mental analysis, memory and imagination constitute a kind of

mental noise in the *psi* channel, and therefore, the closer we can get to raw uninterpreted imagery, the better. We always try to report raw perception (What am I experiencing now? What am I seeing that makes me say such and such?) rather than analysis, since the former tends to be "on target" while the latter is often incorrect. Memory and remote viewing seem to share a similar property, in that for both processes, one scans the subconscious looking for data. In memory, one looks for associations, whereas in remote viewing one looks for surprises. For example, if one is were trying to remember the name of the great baseball slugger on the New York Yankees, he might remember that his first name was Joe. But he can't quite remember his last name. Could it be Joe A? No. Joe B? No.... Joe D. That's it! Joe Dimaggio!

This analytical strategy is ineffective for the purpose of remote viewing. In this *psi* activity, one is looking for the essence or the minimum describable elements of a target. We talk about scattered data bits which we must synthesize into a target only at the end of the viewing. It is as though there are analysis, memory and imagination noise levels, which are high above the *psi* information data. Only momentarily can we quiet this noise, open the trap door, and plunge down into the stillness where the *psi* data reside. Then we can grab a *psi* data bit, or two if we are lucky. It appears that visual artists, other creative types, and experienced meditators are often the most adept at coaxing out the state of passive volition which seems to be so attractive to the illusive *psi*.

In our analytical society, remote viewing tends to be a difficult task for many people. It appears to be similar to the process of perception of subliminal stimuli, in that it requires the full attentive powers of the remote viewer. Both the environment and the procedures are designed to be as natural and comfortable as possible, in order to minimize the diversion of attention to anything other than the task at hand. No hypnosis, strobe lights, sensory-deprivation procedures, or drugs are used, since in our view such (novel) environmental factors would divert some of the subject's much-needed attention. Our experience suggests that a person following these simple procedures will be able to develop their psychic abilities without having to give up their mind, or eat porridge at the feet of their guru.

The interviewer arranges ahead of time to have a bound notebook for record-keeping available, together with pen and paper for drawing. The room lighting should be subdued to prevent after-image highlights, shadows on eyelids, and so forth. Before each trial, we believe it is important to take about a half hour to establish, or reestablish, a feeling of trust, rapport, and seriousness of purpose between the viewer and the interviewer.

When the agreed-upon remote viewing time arrives, the interviewer simply asks the viewer to describe the impressions that come to mind with regard to the target object that he or she will see in two days. At first, the viewer must de-brief (rid his or her thoughts of) the mental images that he or she brought to the session. The interviewer does not pressure the remote viewer to verbalize continuously. If he were to do so, the remote viewer might tend to embroider

descriptions to please the interviewer, which is a well-known syndrome in behavioral studies of this type. If the viewer becomes analytical in reporting the data she perceives ("I see a doll. It must be Raggedy Ann."), the interviewer gently leads her into description, rather than analysis ("You don't have to tell me what it is, just describe what you see."). This is the most important and difficult task of the interviewer, but it is necessary for good results, especially with inexperienced remote viewers. It is also useful for the interviewer to "surprise" the remote viewer with the introduction of alternative viewpoints ("Go above the object, hold it in your hand, tell me about the weight and texture?"). The remote viewer's perception appears to be mobile and able to shift rapidly with a question like this. It is as though the data bits come through before the viewer's defenses activate to block them out. Some shifting of viewpoint also circumvents the potential problem of the viewer's spending the entire session time giving meticulous detail of a relatively trivial item, which, even if correct, will generally be of little use in assessing the session. Once the viewer feels he sees something, he tends to hang on to this perception rather than commit himself to a new viewpoint.

It is important to recognize again that with the division of labor between remote viewer and interviewer, it is the *interviewer's* (not the remote viewer's) responsibility to see that the information necessary to permit discrimination among the range of target possibilities is generated. The remote viewer's responsibility is confined to exercising the remote viewing faculty (describing his mental pictures).

Sometimes the viewer draws a mental blank, and does not have any mental pictures to describe. He says, "I close my eyes, and it's dark." Under these conditions, an intrepid interviewer might say something like the following: "In two days you will see the target. Can you look into your future, and tell me now what you will be experiencing then?" We have found that this approach is often surprisingly successful. It corresponds to our data suggesting that *psi* has a non-local nature, and that there are no known space-time limits to *psi* abilities. Similarly, time appears like a river, on the average, with causes preceding events. However, if we look closely at the fine structure of the stream, we will see eddies in the flow, in which the effect may come before its cause. Physicists, these days, are calling this situation "stochastic" or "probabilistic causality," which is like a temporal uncertainty principle.

Often, a viewer will say, "I see something *like* a fire hydrant." What she is conveying to the interviewer is that she is *not* seeing a fire hydrant. It is then a good time for the interviewer to ask the viewer, "What are you experiencing (seeing) that makes you think of a fire hydrant?" The remote viewer is encouraged to sketch and write down everything she sees, even over her objections that she is not an artist, cannot sketch, etc. She may do so throughout, or wait until the end of the session if intermittent drawing would distract her concentration. Since drawings have often tended to be more accurate than verbaliza-

tions in our research, they are an extremely important aspect of the process for generating positive results.

### Choosing Targets

The choice of appropriate targets is also an important part of successful experiments. In order to limit the universe of images, the target object should be bigger than a match box and smaller than a bread box. It should be geometrically interesting, and extended, rather than compact. For example, a Raggedy Ann doll is easier to describe than an ivory Buddha figurine. A pineapple would be easier to describe than a peach. A hair brush is better than a nail file.

Psychic Ingo Swann used to say to us, "Don't trivialize the ability." By this he meant that a remote viewing object should be attractive, aesthetically pleasing, and experienced by the viewer as equal to the effort involved in describing it: no lumps of coal or #2 pencils. The target should possess a variety of sensory aspects, or what we call "psychic handles." Nothing should be used that might be perceived as frightening or distasteful to the viewer. This is an essential point, since you would not want to violate the viewer's unconditional trust of you or the process. Above all, the viewer should not feel a sense of disappointment when he or she is finally shown the target. The feedback session should arouse the interest and satisfaction of the viewer. One does want the viewer to be disgusted, or be thinking, as Hella Hammid once facetiously exclaimed, "You asked me to separate my body from my consciousness for this?!" In the end, a good target is largely a subjective preference of each viewer. In this experiment the target objects were chosen in pairs for each viewer just before each trial, to avoid the possibility of "displacement" into a target pool. There was no large pre-existing target pool for this experiment.

### Judging Viewer Responses

At the conclusion of each remote viewing session of the experiment we are discussing, the interviewer/judges, DB and WW, returned to their home to do the judging. Together they decided which, if either, of the two objects had been described by each viewer. They accomplished this by carefully reading the transcript from the viewer, and comparing it, through a process of analysis and intuition, with each of the two objects in that viewer's target pool. They assigned a score from the 0-7 point rating scale shown in Table 1 to each viewer's transcript. A judging decision was made in favor of a given target, if there was at least a 2 point difference in scores between a viewer's descriptions of his or her up and down objects, *and* one of the object's descriptions scored at least 4. This judging of binary targets requires much less precision on the part of both judges and the viewers, than previous RV series, where as many as nine transcripts and targets had to be matched. Also, we have learned to believe an experienced viewer when he indicates that the picture he has drawn is "noise" or analytical overlay (AOL), rather than perception of the true target.

These items in the transcript are then given much less weight than others. In the present experiment, the judging session was the first time that the judges saw each other's chosen targets.

The following Tuesday, both viewers received feedback on their own correct object, which corresponded to the actual movement of silver prices. The judges discussed the transcripts with them, and the viewers often took this opportunity to express their opinions about the appropriateness of the targets.

TABLE 1  
0 - 7 Point Rating Scale for Target Transcript Correspondences

7	Excellent correspondence, including good analytical detail (e.g. naming the target by name), and with essentially no incorrect information.
6	Good correspondence with good analytical information (e.g. naming the function of the target), and relatively little incorrect information.
5	Good correspondence with unambiguous unique matchable elements, but some incorrect information.
4	Good correspondence with several matchable elements intermixed with some incorrect information.
3	Mixture of correct and incorrect elements, but enough of the former to indicate that the viewer has made contact with the target.
2	Some correct elements, but not sufficient to suggest results beyond chance expectation.
1	Little correspondence
0	No correspondence

### Applying the Psi-Derived Data

If the two viewers are correct 70% of the time, and wrong 30% of the time, (as we found to be the case during our previous two years of informal trials) they will agree on the wrong target 9% of the time ( $.3 \times .3$ ), and agree on the right target 49 percent of the time. This suggests that out of nine day's trials, approximately five will be traded, and four will be successful.

We actually used a different trading strategy, to give more trading days, based on the idea that misses (30%) are half displacement to the wrong target (15%), and half random output, with no *psi* associated with any target (15%). If that is true, then we can trade either when both people see targets of the same direction, or when one sees a target direction with a score of 5 or greater, and the other passes (no target is seen). In this case, we will get a miss when both people see the wrong target, ( $.15 \times .15 = 2.25\%$  of the time,) or when one person sees nothing and the other displaces ( $2 \times 2.25\% = 4.5\%$  of the time.) This assumption gives a 6.75% miss rate. We trade when both agree, which will likely be 49% of the time, as stated before, plus when either viewer sees a target and the other passes ( $0.7 \times 0.15 = 10\%$  of the time). For the two people, this gives  $2 \times 10\% = 20\%$  additional trading. With these assumptions, we trade 75% of the time we have a trial, and have a 9% error rate on those trials. It is as though every trial is a "confidence call" by the judges. If they don't like the quality of a viewer's description, in their blind matching, they declare it a pass. If they are unable to successfully match either viewer's transcript to a

target, they declare the whole trial a pass. In our experiment, two of the trials were passed by the judges, and seven trials of the nine were hypothetically traded. Six of the trades would have been successful. The possibilities are enumerated in Table 2.

TABLE 2  
The Tabulation of Trading Possibilities.

Viewer A	Viewer B	%	D = Displacement, H = Hit, and P = Pass
H	H	49	TRADE WIN (.7 x .7)
H	P	10.5	TRADE WIN (.7 x .15)
H	D	10.5	NO TRADE - disagreement between viewers
P	H	10.5	TRADE WIN
P	P	2.25	NO TRADE - two passes
P	D	2.25	TRADE LOSE (.15 x .15)
D	H	10.5	NO TRADE - disagreement between viewers
D	P	2.25	TRADE LOSE
D	D	2.25	TRADE LOSE

### What Really Happened

The protocol section of this paper has described the experiment as it was designed. Now, we will relate what actually occurred. In general, we will describe only the correct target object, since that is the only one that was shown to the viewers. In the following, we will present some of the more interesting and correct RV comments by viewers about their targets. Needless to say, the viewers also had incorrect things to say in each transcript, but, in order to receive a score of 4 or greater, there had to have been a strong majority of correct items.

**Trial 1. Hit:** The first target object was a silver and gold pendant, made of flattened wire. It showed two intertwined dancers. RT described it as a "wire sculpture, pink and silver, maybe black," and made a matching sketch which was scored a 5, largely for the "wire sculpture" aspect, and a zig zag shape in the drawing. Trials 1. and 2. each had only a single pair of target objects for the viewers, whereas trials 3-9 provided an independent target pool for each viewer.

**Trial 2. Pass:** The target was a small steel wood screw. JK successfully described an elongated, hard, tapered and pointed object like a carrot with tendrils coming out of it. She also drew a four-pointed star which corresponded to the Phillips-head groove on the screw head. She scored a 5. RT, unfortunately, described the other (down) object with great clarity. As a result, the viewings canceled each other, and the outcome was a pass.

A problem occurred here. It is important for the targets to be of equal psychic valance. Of course, we don't know exactly what that means, but we now think that one should probably not balance a wood screw with a jewel-encrusted golden box, because the person who likes sparkly things will likely be drawn preferentially to the jeweled box. We know, after all, that a psychic has

perfect access to both objects, and it is only the emotional significance or charge derived from the feedback, that allows discrimination.

**Trial 3.** Miss: This was a blown protocol. The viewers had excellent descriptions of the "up" targets: a ceramic sculpture of peas in a pod, and a large douglas fir cone. The judges, that day, obtained the silver data for feedback from the television news rather than the newspaper. They did this because they were so confident that the viewers had the correct answer, based on exceptionally clear target descriptions in the same direction by both of them. Unfortunately, silver futures prices are often different from "spot" silver prices on TV. On this particular day, they traded differently by five tenths of a cent. The result was that we were shown the targets we so aptly described, but they were the wrong targets, as determined by the trend in silver. Since a viewer is asked only to describe the target that he will be shown, this should not be counted as a miss. On the other hand, silver went against us, so it surely wasn't a hit. We will call it a pass for the viewers, and a miss for the trading protocol.

**Trial 4.** Hit: RT's target was a pink marble sculpture of a flamingo. RT was feeling depressed over the possible closing of his laser research laboratory, and the loss of his job. As a result, he had nothing to report during his RV session. JK, on the other hand, gave a fine description of a toy glass bubbler, of the type you hold in your hand to make the ether rise into a fountain. She said, "It is like a champagne glass.... It's tubular.... There's an elongated stem-like part.... Something like a fountain comes up and out." The judges said, "Give that woman a 6." This, together with RT's null result, allowed a decision, and it was correct.

**Trial 5.** Pass: No *psi*. RT's target was an orange flower. RT again drew a blank on his trial. JK didn't do much better with her three-inch disc-shaped temple bells from Tibet, and the trial was declared a pass.

Our experience thus far did not appear to be a great beginning for researcher-based *psi*. However, our efforts provided us with useful learning, and we made some procedural changes. We shortened the forecast time duration from four days to two days, for the reasons described above. We moved the viewing from DB's house to RT's, because the judge's house was full of novel and psychically interesting objects. These appeared to be a noise source for RT, in addition to his other problems. RT's house also has many attractive objects, but they are all entirely familiar, and therefore not a source of psychic noise and enticement. They no longer have any charge for him.

**Trial 6.** Hit: RT's target was a plastic rattle. RT described, "A child's toy made of blue and red plastic, with light coming out of the edge of the plastic.... Also something silver.... There is motion associated with this thing, like a top." He drew a top and lattice-like crossbars, which resembled the openwork of the plastic rattle. The rattle had a silver bell in each end, and the iridescent red and blue plastic was as described. That scored a 6. JK described her wooden box target correctly as a smooth, hand-made ornamental container. In addi-

tion, she drew the unusual shape of the handle on the lid, which looked like two candy kisses.

**Trial 7.** Hit: The target for RT was a wooden child's chair. It was described as wooden with vertical things like fireplace matches. There was a fairly good drawing of a chair. Good enough for a 4.5. JK had a target that she described as being delicate, and commanding respect. "There is an elongated cylindrical part with something on the end of it that attracts attention... another part has different properties... something rotates... two pointed cones intersecting... This thing has to do with light refraction," said JK. The target was a microscope. JK scored another 6, and the descriptions by both viewers were correct in their correspondence to the silver market changes.

**Trial 8.** Hit: Target for RT was a small New Mexican Indian clay pot with a red design. RT said, "It's a dish," and very accurately drew the design. JK's target was a wooden Indonesian mask of Prince Shiva. She said that this is "a religious object... not Christian.... It is regal." She accurately drew its carved textures and the very complex crown of the figure, which greatly resembled the ridged dome of an orange juice squeezer. Both viewers were correct.

**Trial 9.** Hit: RT's target was an Art Deco bowl with a round base and square upper portion. It is china with hand painted flowers around the top and a cross design on each side. RT said it is a "polygonal glass container," which he drew. "It is like a circular cake cover," also drawn.... "It is like stained glass, I can feel the pebbly surface on the glass." The cross decoration was also drawn. Very close to a 7. This was undoubtedly RT's best viewing. When the bowl was handed to RT on Tuesday evening, he was struck by the retro-causal link, that Sunday's perception of this beautiful object seemed to be caused by his experience of it two days later.

On the other hand, JK was visiting family and friends in Seattle, and was having such a stimulating time, that during her RV session she filled two pages with pictures. None of them greatly matched either target, so she was given a pass.

In summary, we had three passes for the viewers and two for the forecasts: One was due to little or no *psi* from either viewer. One was the cancellation of an "up" description by a "down" description, and the third pass was from a blown protocol. The hits came from two instances of little or no *psi* by one viewer, balanced by a good hit from the other; and four cases of both viewers agreeing on the correct target with good to excellent descriptions of the objects. In order for a viewer to be credited with a miss, he or she must have received a rating of at least a 4 on the incorrect target. Otherwise, the transcript would be considered a pass. Thus, in a sense, the protocol was as important in preventing errors as were the judges and the viewers.

The probability of six out of seven successful forecasts of binary events, such as we produced, is  $p = 0.054$ . And the probability of 11 individual binary hits out of 12 trials is 3 in 1000. The data are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3  
Summary of Associative RV Results

Trial #	Viewer JK	Viewer RT	Trade
1	Hit	Hit	Hit
2	Hit	Displacement/Miss	Pass
3	Blown Protocol	Blown Protocol	Miss
4	Hit	Pass	Hit
5	Pass	Pass	Pass
6	Hit	Hit	Hit
7	Hit	Hit	Hit
8	Hit	Hit	Hit
9	Pass	Hit	Hit
Totals	6 Hits, no Misses	5 Hits, 1 Miss	6 Hits, 1 Miss

### Post Hoc Analysis

A second way of parsing this data was suggested by a reviewer who was justifiably troubled by the changes in protocol during the first three trials. It was correctly pointed out to us, that the actual protocol did not stabilize until the fourth trial. Trials 1 and 2, each had a single target pair for the two viewers, raising the stacking effect problem, even though the viewers went in opposite directions on trial 2. Trial 3 was a blown protocol, in that the viewers were shown both sets of targets for feedback. Also, at the end of trial 3, the feedback time was set at two days, rather than four days. We could therefore consider describing this experiment as three trials in a pilot series, followed by six trials with a fixed protocol. The authors do not necessarily favor this interpretation, but it accurately mirrors the events as they occurred. The results would be as shown in Table 4. This yields eight independent binary hits by the viewers, and five correct binary forecasts by the team. More trials are clearly called for, but we believe that the protocol is sufficiently inventive to be presented, even though we have only a handful of trials.

### Conclusions

Two years ago, RT gave a paper at the 1993 Parapsychological Association

TABLE 4

Trial #	Viewer JK	Viewer RT	Trade
1	PILOT TRIAL	PILOT TRIAL	PILOT TRIAL
2	PILOT TRIAL	PILOT TRIAL	PILOT TRIAL
3	PILOT TRIAL	PILOT TRIAL	PILOT TRIAL
4	Hit	Pass	Hit
5	Pass	Pass	Pass
6	Hit	Hit	Hit
7	Hit	Hit	Hit
8	Hit	Hit	Hit
9	Pass	Hit	Hit
Totals	4 Hits, No Misses	4 Hits, No Misses	5 Hits, No Misses

Conference in Toronto entitled, "What I See When I Close My Eyes." In that presentation he described a "friendly telepathic protocol" created by a group of San Francisco Bay Area researchers investigating *psi*. This present paper addresses the concerns of many skeptics in the parapsychological community who thought that we were deluding ourselves with sloppy protocols and sensory leakage from subliminal perception. This experiment demonstrates that multiple viewers, each with their own target pool, can be used in an associative remote viewing protocol to overcome the problems of displacement that has plagued researchers in this area. We, of course, do not know if this is a universal solution, but it is clearly a step in the right direction.

We believe that trust and openness among the participants in the experiment are essential to the process which elicits reliable *psi*. Fear of *psi* often results from fear of uncontrolled intimacy. We think that descriptions from viewers such as "polygonal glass container," "wire sculpture," "regal... rather than religious" object, and "has to do with light refraction," show remarkable flashes of *psi*. We believe that most of the insights derived from this experiment would have been lost, if the viewers had been undergraduate psychology students signing up for an ESP experiment. The researchers here bring both their passion for understanding *psi*, as well as their intellectual abilities, to bear on the experiments that they carry out. Based on our experience, the following are our suggestions and reservations to anyone wishing to carry out remote viewing experiments of the type we have described here.

#### *Proposed Guidelines for Remote Viewing*

- Use selected viewers with a proven track record.
- Pay attention to each viewer by giving consideration to his or her mental state at the time of the experiment.
- Provide trial-by-trial feedback of only the correct target, and do it as soon as feasible.
- Create trust by full disclosure, and no hidden agendas.
- *Psi* is a partnership, not a master/slave relationship.
- Seriousness of purpose provides motivation to both the viewer and the experimenter.
- Targets should be attractive and uniquely different: No tarantulas for viewers who don't want to experience them.
- Do not create large target pools, 2 to 4 items at most.
- Take enough time to achieve rapport, plus 10 to 30 minutes for a trial. One trial per day is plenty.
- Practice allows viewers to recognize mental noise and separate it from the *psi* signal.

It is possibly because of this humanistic approach, emphasizing rapport, that the remote viewing protocol appears to be the most reliable (largest effect size) of the various parapsychological paradigms being examined today.

Through a cooperative effort, the four co-authors dodged numerous bullets throughout the experiment we have described here. We consider the rapport among experimenters to be paramount throughout the process. We took the time, when necessary, to solve discordant moods of participants in an honest and intimate fashion. Through it all, an imaginative and rigorous protocol, and an enduring community of spirit prevailed.

### References

- Hansen, G., M. Schlitz, and C. Tart (1984). Summary of remote viewing research. In R. Targ and K. Harary, *The Mind Race, 1972-1982*. New York: Villard.
- Harary, Keith and Russell Targ (1985). A new approach to forecasting commodity futures. *Psi Research*, December.
- May, Edwin C. (1995). Private communication to Russell Targ.
- Puthoff, H. E. and R. Targ (1976). A perceptual channel for information transfer over kilometer distances: historical perspective and recent research. *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 64, No. 3.
- Puthoff, H. E. (1985). ARV associational remote viewing applications. *Research In Parapsychology 1984*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Puthoff, H. E., R. Targ and E. C. May (1979). Experimental psi research: Implications for physics. *Proc. 14th National Meeting*. Houston, Texas: AAAS.
- Targ, Elisabeth, Russell Targ and Olivier Lichtarg (1985). Real-time clairvoyance: A study of remote viewing without feedback. *Journal of the American Soc. Psych. Res.*, September.
- Targ, R. and H. E. Puthoff (1974). Information transmission under conditions of sensory shielding. *Nature*, Vol. 251, 602.
- Targ, Russell, Elisabeth Targ, and Keith Harary (1984). Moscow — San Francisco remote viewing experiment. *Psi Research*, Vol. 3, No. 3/4.
- Targ, Russell, William Braud, Marilyn Schlitz, Rex Stanford, and Charles Honorton (1991). Increasing psychic reliability. A panel discussion presented at the 33rd annual conference of the Parapsychological Assn., Chevy Chase, M.D. Aug. 16-20, 1990: *Journal of Parapsychology*, Vol. 55, p. 59.
- Targ, R. (1994). What I see when I close my eyes. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1994.