Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

ELSEVIER

Technological Forecasting & Social Change xx (2007) xxx–xxx

Technological Forecasting and Social Change

Note: The opinions expressed in this column are those of the author, with no implication of agreement by either the editors or the Advisory Board. The question it raises is whether further research into this controversial area as a technological forecasting approach is desirable, or unwarranted as being based on questionable fringe science. It is interesting to note, for example, that experimental research on instinct or intuition by Dr. Gerd Gigerenzer, director of the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin, indicates that intuitive wisdom often outperforms the calculations of experts (see his book "Gut Feelings: The Intelligence of the Unconscious" (2007); also *New York Times*, August 28, 2007).

Harold A. Linstone
Editor-in-Chief

FROM MY PERSPECTIVE

Remote viewing as applied to futures studies

James H. Lee

Future Studies Program, University of Houston, United States

Received 15 August 2006; received in revised form 13 September 2006; accepted 15 September 2006

Abstract

Remote viewing is set of related protocols that allow a viewer to intuitively gather information regarding a specific target that is hidden from physical view and separated from the viewer by either time or distance. Research suggests that the same processes used to gather spatially non-local information can also be used to gather information that is temporally removed from the observer. This paper reviews the most common protocols for remote viewing — including Coordinate Remote Viewing (CRV), Associative Remote Viewing (ARV), and Extended Remote Viewing (ERV). [1]

This remains a controversial field of study. While over 30 years of data has been gathered with statistically significant results frequently occurring under laboratory conditions, skeptics are not convinced that RV is a useful pursuit. In addition to this, some of the output from RV can be vague and subject to personal interpretation.

A number of factors have been shown to improve the success rate for remote viewing, including the use of experienced subjects, individual testing, feedback of results, and a short time-interval between the percipient response and the targeted future event. Finally, there also appears to be a relationship between the effectiveness of

E-mail address: lee-advisor@operamail.com.

[1] I gratefully acknowledge the guidance of Emeritus Professor Oliver Markley, who served as a mentor for the research leading to this paper.

doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

remote viewing efforts and sidereal time, which may be interpreted as evidence that some aspects of RV are subject to the same physical laws as are other phenomena studied by science.

Remote viewing and related processes merit further exploration and study. While remote viewing may never be completely understood, it has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to the professional futurist′s toolbox.

Keywords: Remote viewing; Precognition; ERV; ARV; CRV

1. Introduction

While "creative" thinking in the form of scenario development has become part of the futurist mainstream, "intuitive" processes have in many ways been misunderstood or underutilized by professional futurists. The profession has long sought to distance methods of futures research from the domain of the mystical or esoteric. In doing so, futurists have managed to create some credibility for the profession, but at the possible cost of inhibiting the development of some promising approaches for understanding the future.

A growing body of literature suggests that anomalous precognition of the future has been widely experienced by the public. In a recent survey conducted at the University of Alabama, over half of the randomly selected participants have experienced a dream-based premonition. Fifty-three percent reported premonitions of future events that later happened. Forty-five-percent have changed travel plans as a result of an intuitive "sense", and subsequently have saved themselves effort or injury [1].[2]

The frequency of these occurrences is too high to simply be ignored or explained away, yet the current level of science is unable to construct a mechanism to explain the anomalous transference of information over time and distance.

Meanwhile, early attempts at proving the existence of precognition in a research setting have been consistently inconsistent. Promising and highly statistically significant results often occur, only to be followed by a string of failures. One researcher describes precognition and other psi effects as being "capricious, unsustainable, and actively evasive". In many ways, psi effects exhibit "a mind of their own" and do not willingly participate in scientific efforts to prove their existence [2].

This produces an interesting dilemma for futurists. Psi effects are widely experienced by the public and often provide clear linkages to the future — yet the stability of these linkages is often in doubt. Is there a scientifically robust means of using psi as an input to forecasting the future? Are there protocols by which futurists can apply intuitive techniques without "going off the deep end?" And finally, how can futurists improve the accuracy of their results using these methods?

These are some of the topics that we will address in this paper.

2. The evolution of remote viewing

One of the most promising developments in psi research over the past few decades has been in the area of "remote viewing". This process was originally pioneered in the early 1970′s by Russell Targ

[2] A potential limitation of this study would be the reliance on self-reporting, which potentially biases results — especially if students were aware of the reason/goal of study (i.e., recall bias).

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

and Harold (Hal) Puthoff at Electronics and Bioengineering laboratory at the Stanford Research Institute (SRI). Remote viewing is described as a perceptual ability by which individuals are able to describe and experience objects, pictures, and locations which are blocked from ordinary sensory perception [3].

The foundational process that they developed became known as "Outbounder Remote Viewing". They initially required the use of several participants, each with their own unique roles.

2.1. Target selector

This is a person who selects the target pool. Care is taken so as to prevent leakage of information regarding these targets to the remote viewer, the judges involved in analyzing or evaluating the remote viewing. Typically an intermediary is used to transfer instructions regarding the target destination to the outbounder via a sealed envelope.

2.2. Outbounder

The person who physically visits the target site, and provides a target address to the remote viewer by way of his or her presence.

2.3. Remote viewer

This is the person who actually does the remote viewing. The remote viewer starts the process by entering into focused relaxation or meditation. This can be done through any number of means, such as progressive relaxation, focused breathing, or entrainment with a light/sound rhythm. The theory holds that brain wave activity during this period will typically shift from an alert beta state (15–40 cps) through alpha (9–14 cps) and into theta (5–8 cps). This resulting state will often allow total dissociation from the immediate surroundings and a closer affiliation with the target and its surroundings. The remote viewer then makes note of the information received, in the form of drawings, verbal descriptions, etc. (For a walk-through of an internal process that a remote viewer can follow, refer to: http://www.greaterreality.com/rv/instruct.htm). Remote viewers are often referred to in the literature as *percipients*.

2.4. Analyst (optional)

The role of this person is to ask questions of the remote viewer to clarify the nature of the images and the sensations that he or she is receiving.

2.5. Judge

This is the person who evaluates the material, and determines whether or not there is a match between the remote viewing information and the target. In some cases, there may be a set of pre-determined questions that need to be answered. Other experiments may require judges to rank and match pictures of a group of target locations with the each set of target descriptions as provided by the remote viewer. The Judge has no contact with the other participants in the experiment until after the evaluation has been completed [4].

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

In their seminal paper on the subject, *A Perceptual Channel for Information Transfer over Kilometer Distances*, Russell and Targ discuss a set of over 50 experiments performed under controlled laboratory conditions. The initial studies were done in and around the Silicon Valley area. The remote viewers were able to correctly describe (often in great detail) geographical and man-made targets, including buildings, laboratory equipment, and the like. The descriptions occurred within the context of "double-blind" experiments in which neither the remote viewers, the analysts or, the judges knew the nature of the targets being described.

By matching the distribution of target rankings of blind judges to transcripts produced by experienced remote viewers as associated with target locations, Russell and Targ reported results that were statistically significant within the .05 level in five out of six experiments, with the sixth experiment being suggestive, but not conclusive [5].

It could be argued that the original participants would have been familiar with the local landmarks and landscape of the Stanford area. Further research by Targ indicates that that the accuracy and resolution of the RV targets appears to be insensitive to variations in distance [6]. A remote viewer was able to get an equally clear picture of a location at the other end of the campus as he would get from a target in Central America [7].

Things get even more interesting when the constraints are made more difficult. In an experiment by Bisaha and Dunne, a series of precognitive remote viewing trials were conducted between northern Wisconsin and various sites in Eastern Europe. The percipient was asked to describe the location of the outbounder, 5,000 miles away and 24 h into the future. The outbounder was then asked to concentrate on his surroundings at the target time and location and take a photograph to be later compared with the percipient's descriptions. The photographs were then given to a judge to create a rank matches between the target destinations with the descriptions provided by the remote viewer. The results were accurate with statistical significance of $p<.005$ in comparison to a random match of targets [8].

The structure of these experiments would suggest that there is a relationship between the percipient and the outbounder. If the core element in success for these experiments was based on telepathy, then the usefulness of remote viewing surveys into the future may be limited to those occasions when there was a willing "sender" of the data to the remote viewer. For the purpose of applications such as military intelligence gathering, a willing sender may simply not be available. Furthermore, the cost of sending an outbounder to a location could completely offset the economic benefits of gathering information from remote viewing!

Ingo Swann suggested the answer — why not establish map coordinates as the target at "focal point" for the remote viewer? The remote viewers at SRI were then given map coordinates, with no other information, and the results that they generated were just as accurate as with the original "outbounder protocol."

Skeptics at that time were claiming that percipients were tapping into "eidetic" (photographic) memory regarding geographic coordinates. It was not a matter of "seeing" what they were seeing, so much as it was "knowing" what was collectively known about a geographic destination. So, in a following round of experiments, the actual coordinates were placed inside a sealed envelope, with the target being identified by a string of random numbers printed on the outside of the envelope. This number becomes the new "target" and was the only piece of data given to the percipient. The percipient was then asked to describe the destination notated within the target envelope. This protocol later become known as CRV (Coordinate, or alternatively, Controlled Remote Viewing) [9].

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

By now, experienced percipients were describing locations based on abstractions (mapping coordinates) represented by symbols (the random number string). Each subsequent revision of protocols seemed to place the percipient further and further away from having any idea what he or she was supposed to be viewing.

Eventually, the contents of the "target" envelope would be broadened from geographic destinations to include just about anything, from photographs of people, to the names of concepts, to future dates and events….

So, if remote viewing is flexible enough to gather data irrespective of time or distance, how can futurists incorporate it in their "toolbox?"

3. Protocols for precognitive remote viewing

3.1. Associative remote viewing

Later studies performed at SRI indicated that it does not appear any more difficult to know the hidden future than it takes to know hidden information in the present.

For example, Russell Targ did an experiment to guess the future roll of a die. Six pictures were chosen unbeknownst to the percipient — each picture representing the number displayed by the die at a later time. A picture was randomly selected and put in an envelope, and then shown to the viewer after the die was rolled. The results were just as good as when the subject was asked to view a hidden picture in the present [10]. This experiment later formed the foundation of a foundational protocol known as Associative Remote Viewing (ARV).

In ARV, the objective is not to "foresee" individual events directly, but rather to obtain remotely viewed images of objects pre-associated with defined outcomes. This has the advantage of creating a "failsafe" mechanism — if the images gathered by remote viewing did not match any of the objects pre-selected for the target pool, the results are considered invalid.

ARV also has another distinct advantage. Swann and Targ both agree that it is exceptionally difficult to read words (such as headlines) and numbers (such as stock prices) while remote viewing. At earlier stages of experience, most remote viewers suffer from a form of "RV dyslexia", in which similar geometric elements rearrange themselves [11]. By replacing outcomes with substantially different objects, a "workaround" to this problem is possible.

ARV is useful primarily when there is a limited number of possible future outcomes. It is exceptionally useful when there is a "binary" outcome, such as deciding whether a certain investment will make or lose money with a set time frame.

Targ's best-known experiment involved forecasting the price of silver over a series of one-week periods. In this experiment, there were four potential outcomes for each week. The outcomes were separated in to "up a little" ($<+\$.25$), "up a lot" ($\geq+\$.25$), "down a little" ($<-\$.25$) or "down a lot" ($\geq-\$.25$). These four discrete conditions would be represented by such diverse objects as a light bulb, a flower, a book, or a stuffed animal.

The sponsor of the experiment (a professional investor) picked the four objects, while Targ contacted by phone the remote viewer to get his impressions of the object "associated" with the outcome of the silver market for that week. Based on the description of the remote viewer, silver futures contracts were bought or sold, and then liquidate at the end of the week. Of the nine forecasts performed in this experiment, all

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

nine were correct, and over $120,000 was earned. The story subsequently made the front page of the Wall Street Journal [12].

The experiment was repeated the following year with the intention of making more money, but reportedly failed under a combination of botched protocol and greed [13].

Targ revised the weekly experiments with a group of friends in 1995. This time, Targ refined his protocol over his previous experiments to include error detection. If the remote viewers each identified two different targets (one associated with the "up" state and one associated with the "down" state), they would have the potential to cancel each other out. If one of the remote viewers failed to identify any target while the other succeeded, a "trade" was entered based on the target that was identified. In this experiment, the remote viewers accurately predicted the outcome of the silver market eleven out of twelve times ($p=0.003$) [14].

Using ARV in conjunction with evaluation of prospective policies and their potential outcomes could be difficult. In the case where the remote viewing was successful, and the policy/strategy was implemented and successful, you could create conceivably remote view a "hit". If the policy was unsuccessful, but the remote viewing was successful at identifying the failure, the policy may not be undertaken at all, and therefore feedback may not be generated — potentially eliminating the possibility of successfully remote viewing the failure.

Meanwhile, there is always a chance that a policy would have been successful, but was not undertaken due to a failure in the RV. Therefore, the best application of precognitive ARV would be to assess the future state of variables— irregardless of choices made and actions taken. Otherwise, the complexities of temporal paradox potentially overwhelm the process.

3.2. Forward targeting using extended remote viewing

Remote viewing is typically a team effort. However, Joseph McMoneagle developed an interesting strategy for developing a pool of remote viewing targets for the solo practitioner, while avoiding the issues of "front-loading" (i.e., providing information to the percipient on the nature of the target). McMoneagle writes the dates of intended target with a targeting phrase on a series of 3 × 5 in. cards, and then seals each card within an envelope.

Examples of targets would include the following:

- Describe the status of Social Security years 2050–2060
- Describe primary transportation between years 2025–2050
- Describe a significant change in civil law for years 2000–2075.

He then randomly selects envelopes for remote viewing — not knowing the target content. An assumption that he follows for each viewing is that the information provided is pertinent to the United States, unless the target indicates otherwise.

McMoneagle uses an open-ended response style that he refers to as ERV (Extended Remote Viewing). Images, feelings, associations are all written down by the viewer, to be analyzed at a later time. If the remotely viewed information is complete, he will then input into his computer for further reference, and destroy the card. If the information is incomplete or cannot be understood in context with the question, it is notated in his files and the card is "recycled" into a fresh envelope. Similarly, if there is a complete "miss" of the information received via RV, the card will also be recycled. In any

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

case, the stack of targets is always large enough to preclude prior knowledge of the target being selected.

McMoneagle outlines more about his outcomes of these experiments in his book *The Ultimate Time Machine (1998)*. The second half is filled with forecasts regarding technology, the environment, and social change.

An *ex post facto* review of the book indicates that McMoneagle was correct in forecasting the recent bear market beginning in 2001, a second war in Iraq, and the development of stereo surround sound by 2002. Most of his predictions, however, span from 2010–2100, making it premature to evaluate them at this time.

The drawback of this method of ERV as applied to viewing the future is that it requires a combination of intuitive gifts, or training, or both. It could require a sustained learning effort over time to be useable within the context of a futures consulting practice.

3.3. Virtual time travel

A related method not associated directly with remote viewing is Oliver Markley′s visioning-based protocol that is alternately called Visionary/Virtual Time Travel [15]. In this approach, the percipient is brought into a more relaxed, receptive state by a facilitator. The percipient is then told to visualize putting aside biasing beliefs and expectations. Finally, the percipient is invited to use the "theatre of his own imagination" to travel through each of several alternate futures, each of which is contingent on a specific policy option or other "scenario" conditions. These experienced outcomes are communicated to the facilitator, and then later compared and assessed.

This process is very inner-directed, and seems to be particularly effective at bringing up unintended or unanticipated implications of various choices.[3]

Virtual time travel appears to be related to remote viewing, in that an intuitive projection into the future is required of the percipient. It differs from RV in that target is known to both the percipient and the facilitator.

One of the key differences of between virtual time travel and remote viewing is the nature of the input received by the process. While RV data is received subjectively, the information (in most cases) is fairly literal. Things often simply "are" what they appear to be. Virtual time travel can produce output that is alternately literal or symbolic. The images received through this method can be directly representational of future places and things, or they can be symbolic/metaphorical.

The facilitator plays an important role in deciphering the specific meaning of the symbolic data for the percipient. A short dialogue between facilitator and percipient can often assign the appropriate symbolic meanings through associated cultural or individual frameworks.

It is quite possible that the subconscious (or super-conscious) mind communicates more easily through symbols than through direct representation. This could explain why virtual time travel is often more accessible to the lay person than direct viewing. Much valuable insight can be lost or filtered out in the pursuit of factual, concrete imagery. Furthermore, retrieval of tangible data or "facts" can cause much information to be lost in translation. A lack of appropriate social or technological context can

[3] This process has been repeatedly with positive results in many settings (both research and corporate consulting) including a retreat for the Association of Professional Futurists in fall of 2005.

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

render future concepts and images relatively meaningless or incomprehensible. In comparison, symbolic imagery has more emotional and psychic impact, leading to greater ease of perception and retrieval.

Remote viewing has some likelihood of gaining greater acceptance within the scientific community because it is in many ways more concrete and the results more quantifiable. These qualities may, however, be of less use to the futurist than understanding the full range of implications and outcomes resulting from a future event. As such, there may be a trade-off between accessing literal "data" and meaningful "wisdom".

4. Critical assessments of remote viewing

Two significant studies have been sponsored by the government to assess the utility of remote viewing for the purpose of gathering military intelligence.

The first major study was performed by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Science at the request of the Army Research Institute. This review was conducted under the direction of David Goslin, who subsequently moved on to become president of the American Institutes for Research (AIR). The resulting report, *Enhancing Human Performance: Issues, Theories, and Techniques*, was predominately negative concerning the utility of remote viewing.

From a methodological perspective, it criticizes the SRI experiments as having a high degree of serial dependence resulting from the use of a common pool of remote viewing targets. By eliminating successful "hits" from early trials, the size of the remaining pool is reduced, increasing the likelihood of correct "hits" for subsequent trials. Ray Hyman also warns of the problems of sensory cueing occurring from the subsequent visitation of target sites by the percipient [16]. After recalculation of probabilities by Kennedy to correct for series dependence, the pool of statistically significant remote viewing tests by Targ and Puthoff (1976) and Bisaha/Dunne (1979) was reduced by approximately one-half, but not eliminated [17].

A subsequent review of military-based applications for remote viewing was commissioned by the CIA, and completed in 1995 by the American Institutes for Research. In this report, statistician Jessica Utts writes that statistically significant effects were repeatedly demonstrated in laboratory settings. Ray Hyman, meanwhile, comments that the remote viewing efforts sponsored by the government failed to produce actionable intelligence. The report concludes that "information provided by remote viewing is vague and ambiguous, making it difficult, if not impossible, for the technique to yield information of sufficient quality and accuracy of information for actionable intelligence" [18].

Joseph McMoneagle, a key participant in the military's remote viewing programs, reports that the authors of the NRC and AIR reports did not have the security clearances required to access all of the material gathered by military remote viewers, and that the most useful files were kept confidential and out of reach [19].

The literature assessing the validity of remote viewing is often contentious. When both supporters and skeptics take part in the same panels and review studies, they often come away with their views essentially unchanged. There also appears to be anecdotal evidence that personal beliefs and biases regarding anomalous cognition have a direct impact on the frequency at which these effects are experienced and/or recognized by the individual.

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

Similarly, personal belief systems may result in increased or diminished levels of evidence required to provide adequate levels of "proof". A clear conclusion may only be reached after both sides reach a consensus regarding what constitutes an acceptable level of evidence and usefulness.

5. Factors of success in remote viewing

Russell Targ reports that the effect size (*z*-score) of RV studies were frequently in the .65 range. This means that the average respondent in the experimental group obtained better results than 65% of respondents who were randomly "guessing" qualities of the RV target.

Targ states that "seriousness of purpose, feedback, heart-to-heart trust among participants, and acceptance of psi all enhance remote viewing." Targ then continues to say that a supportive community environment and positive expectations on the part of the experimenter can combine to improve the likelihood of success [20].

There are other elements that are supportive of success in remote viewing, including the following [21].

- Experienced vs. inexperienced subjects
- Individual vs. group testing
- Feedback of results vs. non-feedback
- Short time-interval between the percipient response and the future event.

In a retrospective analysis of 309 forced-choice precognition experiments between 1935 and 1987, Honorton and Ferrari found that 87.5% of the studies that contained all four of these factors had statistically significant results. By contrast, studies conducted under conditions where none of these factors were met failed to produce any significant results at all [22].

Remote viewing is (to a certain extent) trainable – and experience can make a difference. In a collection of related experiments conducted from 1983 to 1989 at the Psychophysical Research Laboratories (Princeton, NJ) the results for novices were separated from experienced subjects. The overall effect size for the novice remote viewing group was 0.17, while the effect size for the experienced group was .385. The effect sizes for novices and experienced subjects at SRI proved to be remarkably similar [23].

ESP experiments in group and classroom settings often create effect sizes of 0.2 and below. This is considered to result from a number of factors, including lack of training, attention, timely feedback, seriousness of intent, focus, and group motivation [24].

The significance of feedback is a source of some debate in the research community. Studies have been performed showing the precognition effects exist without the use of feedback. Other researchers feel that post-experiment feedback is a communication channel that enables precognition to occur.

In either case, it would be reasonable to suggest that it is important to show the remote viewer the correct target after each trial as part of the learning process. Similarly, feedback can help more experienced viewers learn to differential authentic images from mental noise (including memory and imagination).

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

The need for a short-time interval between the remote viewing and the generation of the target has been contested by Robert Jahn and Brenda Dunne at Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research (PEAR). They report that

> "Among the more interesting findings is parametric evidence that the degree of anomalous information transfer is unaffected by spatial and temporal separations. Similarly, there is no evidence that scoring is related to positive or negative temporal separations of the perception effort and the target visit, up to as much as a few days...[25]."

However, it is well worth noting that the decay in accuracy for remote viewing would need to extend well beyond a matter of days (perhaps even months) to enable this process to be of interest for futurists. Unfortunately, little such long-term research is available. Post-experiment feedback to the remote viewer is not clearly necessary, nor even possible, in many types of coordinate remote viewing. There are similar obstacles to providing feedback in the case of remote reviewing targets in the distant future.

One of the paradoxes of remote viewing is that reducing the amount of information available to the view appears to have no impact on the quality of the output. Some observers, such as Joseph McMoneagle, feel that the front-loading of information to remote viewers only detracts from results, possibly through encouraging analysis by the rational part of the mind.

Jahn and Dunne also note that there is some antagonism between successful anomalous cognition and the analytical content required of the remote viewer. When the percipients are front-loaded with data concerning the target, or are required to filter their personal responses into a multiple-choice study, the "locus of the experience had shifted from the realm of intuition to that of intellect." Similarly, efforts to "quantify" or "name" images derived from remote perception often lead to greater inaccuracies. As a result, most RVers are asked to initially draw or describe what they are seeing, to avoid the judgment involved with naming or labeling perceptions [26].

6. Sidereal time and remote viewing

Almost nothing is known about the physical mechanism of remote viewing or other expressions of ESP. One of the first steps towards generating a viable hypothesis would be the discovery of a physical parameter which clearly influenced performance of anomalous cognition.

In a meta-study reviewing 1468 free response trials, Spottiswoode notes that there is a significant increase in the effect size of anomalous cognition during periods within 1 h of 13.5 h local sidereal time (LST). During this time frame, the effect size increased by 340% for all trials ($p=0.001$). An independent database of 1015 similar trials was subsequently obtained in which trials during the same time frame during the sidereal day showed an increase in the effect size of 450% ($p=0.05$), confirming the effect [27].

In simple terms, when the remote viewer is standing on the side of the earth opposite from the core of the Milky Way galaxy, the frequency of accurate anomalous cognition increases by a factor of four.

This could be considered evidence of a causal connection between performance and the orientation of the receiver (i.e., a term for subject or participant), the earth and the fixed stars. Spottiswoode concludes

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

that, "assuming that some unknown systematic bias is not present in the data, it appears that performance of anomalous cognition is strongly dependent upon the Local Sidereal Time (LST) at which the trial occurs.

In a subsequent paper, Spottiswoode notes that geomagnetic fluctuations tend to be the lowest during the same window of sidereal time that remote viewing is shown to be the most effective [28]. This relationship could either be construed as covariance, or as another clue towards understanding the mechanisms of remote viewing.

7. Conclusion

Remote viewing offers a number of interesting possibilities for Futures Studies. While most studies of remote viewing have been for relatively short-time periods, they have in many cases produced statistically significant results in support of anomalous cognition of the future.

The availability of a consistent and robust means for intuitively experiencing the future could make a meaningful contribution to the professional futurist's toolbox.

Several remote viewing protocols have been developed specifically with the intent of viewing future conditions. These include Extended Remote Viewing and Associative Remote Viewing. ERV seems to be most useful at selecting between a finite number of futures states. ERV can generate a wider range of responses, but may require significant training in order to provide understandable output. Meanwhile, Virtual Time Travel is an alternative protocol that is related to remote viewing and can provide more immediately useful results than either ERV or ARV. While ERV and ARV provide more in the way of factual, measurable output, the importance of symbolic data gathered through processes such as virtual time travel should not be understated.

Remote viewing can be trained, and there are a several factors that can leader to a greater likelihood of success in remote viewing. A further study of these factors may lead to a better understanding of the mechanisms behind remote viewing and other forms of precognition.

Finally, it is worth noting that many professional futurists take pride in the proposition that futures research is open to provocative ideas of various types which may lead to new paradigms of understanding and practice — especially those that have proven themselves by process of scientific validation. Thus, the idea of remote viewing as a promising practice for futurists provides a most interesting source of discussion.

References

[1] L. Powell, J. Mack, Perceptions of non-local communication incidences associated with media consumption and individual differences, N. Am. J. Psychol. 7 (2) (2005) 279–294.
[2] J.E. Kennedy, The capricious, actively evasive, and unsustainable nature of psi: a summary and hypothesis, J. Parapsychol. 67 (2003) 53–74.
[3] R. Targ, J. Katra, Remote viewing in a group setting, J. Sci. Explor. 14 (1) (2000) 107–114.
[4] J. McMoneagle, Remote Viewing Secrets, Hampton Roads Publishing, Charlottesville, 2000.
[5] H. Puthoff, R. Targ, A perceptual channel for information transfer over kilometer distances: historical perspective and recent research, Proc. IEEE 64 (1976) 329–354.
[6] R. Targ, J. Katra, Miracles of Mind: Exploring Nonlocal Consciousness and Spiritual Healing, New World Library, Novato, CA, 1998.

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001

[7] Puthoff and Targ (1976).
[8] J. Bisaha, B. Dunne, Multiple subject and long-distance precognitive remote viewing of geographical locations, in: Charles Tart, Harold Puthoff, Russell Targ (Eds.), Reprinted in *Mind At Large*, Hampton Roads Publishing, Charlottesville, VA, 2000.
[9] Peter Rzeszotarski in discussion with author (December 2005).
[10] D. Radin, Precognition, Presentiment, and Remote Viewing (speech at the Esalen Invitational Conference "Subtle Energies and the Uncharted Realms of the Mind", June 6–11 1999.
[11] R. Targ, Limitless Mind, New World Library, Novato, CA, 2004, p. 53.
[12] Eric Larson, Did Psychic Powers Give Firm a Killing in the Silver Market? Wall Street J. (Oct 22 1984) 1.
[13] Targ (2004).
[14] R. Targ, J. Katra, Viewing the future: a pilot study with an error-detecting protocol, J. Sci. Explor. 9 (3) (1995) 367–380.
[15] O. Markley, Protocol and Script for Visionary Time Travel as a Procedure for Assessment of Strategic Choices", http://www.owmarkley.org/inward/Docs/VisionaryTimeTravelCS.htm, 2004.
[16] R. Hyman, Psychics and scientists: a review of R. Targ and H. Puthoff 'Mind Reach', Humanist 37 (May/June 1979) 16–20.
[17] J. Kennedy, Methodological problems in free-response ESP experiments, J. Am. Soc. Psych. Res. 73 (1979).
[18] M. Mumford, A. Rose, D. Goslin, An Evaluation of Remote Viewing: Research and Applications, The American Institutes for Research, 1995.
[19] J. McMoneagle, The Stargate Chronicles: Memoirs of a Master Spy, Hampton Roads Publishing, Charlottesville VA, 2002.
[20] Targ and Katra (2000).
[21] Targ (2004).
[22] C. Honorton, D. Ferrari, Future-telling: a meta-analysis of forced-choice precognition experiments, J. Parapsychol. 53 (1989) 209–281.
[23] Mumford and Goslin (1995).
[24] Honorton and Ferrari (1989).
[25] R. Nelson, B. Dunne, Y. Dobyns, R. Jahn, Precognitive remote perception: replication of remote viewing, J. Sci. Explor. 10 (1996) 109–110.
[26] B. Dunne, R. Jahn, Information and uncertainty in remote perception research, J. Sci. Explor. 17 (2003) 207–242.
[27] J. Spottiswoode, Apparent association between effect size in free response anomalous cognition experiments and local sidereal time, J. Sci. Explor. 11 (2) (1997).
[28] J. Spottiswoode, Geomagnetic fluctuation and free-response anomalous cognition: a new understanding, J. Parapsychol. 61 (1997).

James H. Lee is a student in the Graduate Program in Future Studies at the University of Houston.

Please cite this article as: James H. Lee, Remote viewing as applied to futures studies, Technological Forecasting & Social Change (2007), doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2006.09.001