



Experts' Remote Viewing Guidelines

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Jimmy Akin

International Remote Viewing
Association, USA
jimmyakin01@gmail.com

Patrizio Tressoldi

Science of Consciousness Research
Group-Studium Patavinum Padova
University, Italy

Debra Lynne Katz

California Institute for Human
Sciences, Encinitas, California, USA

SUBMITTED April 9, 2025
ACCEPTED June 6, 2025
PUBLISHED March 26, 2026

<https://doi.org/10.31275/20263687>

GOLD OPEN ACCESS



Creative Commons License 4.0.
CC-BY-NC. Attribution required.
No commercial use.

ABSTRACT

A survey of renowned experts in remote viewing was conducted to gather their opinions on recommended procedures and conditions for obtaining the best results with real-time remote viewing and precognition tasks. Eleven experts responded. Findings revealed both areas of consensus and notable divergences. Experts generally agreed that structured training, such as Controlled Remote Viewing (CRV), produces more reliable results. They emphasized the necessity of maintaining a neutral, distraction-free environment, with some highlighting the role of meditation and mental discipline in enhancing accuracy. Respondents recommended that participants have at least one year of experience in remote viewing protocols. Some suggested practicing meditation before the task and allowing participants ample time, as defined by the viewer themselves, to complete their sessions, which can be conducted solo or in small groups. Experts also agreed on the importance of blinding procedures to prevent contamination of results and the value of using multiple independent viewers in operational applications. However, differences emerged regarding the flexibility of remote viewing methodologies. Some experts advocated for strict adherence to structured protocols, while others argued that individual talent and self-developed techniques could be equally effective. Opinions also varied on the role of viewer feedback, with some emphasizing its necessity for skill improvement while others warned of potential displacement effects. Overall, this expert-driven analysis highlights critical methodological considerations for optimizing remote viewing performance. While fundamental principles such as training, environmental control, and blinding are widely accepted, further research is needed to empirically compare the effectiveness of differing methodologies. These findings offer a provisional framework for future studies and operational remote viewing project management.

KEYWORDS

Remote viewing, extrasensory perception, meta-analysis, expert consensus, methodology.

Remote viewing is a unique perceptual discipline used to acquire information beyond the reach of ordinary physical senses. Remote Viewing has been defined as, "the ability of a person to access and describe, by mental means alone, information blocked from ordinary perception by distance, shielding, or time" (Utts, 1996, p. 3).

It gained notable attention during the Cold War when so-called "psychic spies" employed it for classified military operations. Remote viewing has a rich history, not only



as an intelligence-gathering tool but also as the subject of research and practical applications in the civilian sector (International Remote Viewing Association [IRVA], n.d.).

A recent meta-analysis by Tressoldi and Katz (2023) examined remote viewing experiments conducted over 50 years, finding that protocols for remote viewing experiments yielded stronger results than other extrasensory perception methods. In recent years, remote viewing has experienced a resurgence in popularity, finding applications across diverse fields such as intelligence, medicine, business, science, financial forecasting. A survey by Katz and Tressoldi (2022) highlights this trend, noting that practitioners are increasingly engaging in projects like crime solving, locating missing objects, and financial forecasting.

One prominent methodology employed for predicting future events, including stock market fluctuations, horse racing outcomes, football games, and presidential elections, is *Associative Remote Viewing* (ARV). ARV involves associating potential outcomes of an event with unrelated stimuli—commonly photographs or video clips, but sometimes even tastes or smells—to expand the range of target choices. Remote viewers are then tasked with describing the feedback they will receive after the event, which corresponds solely to the actualized outcome (Katz & Knowles, 2021). For instance, Smith et al. (2014) conducted an ARV experiment where ten inexperienced remote viewers attempted to predict the direction of the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA). For each trial, one image was paired with a downward movement of the DJIA, and another with an upward movement. Each participant did a remote viewing session, and an independent judge made a prediction and wager on which direction the DJIA would take. The study reported a 100% success rate over seven trials, leading to significant financial gains. Similarly, Katz et al. (2017) employed ARV to predict the outcome of the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election. In this double-blind study, 41 experienced remote viewers described feedback photos linked to potential election outcomes. The results indicated significant differences in descriptions, suggesting that while the viewers did not always describe the photo they were shown, they often tuned into photos associated with other outcomes, raising questions about the reliability of large group consensus approaches in ARV projects.

These examples underscore the growing interest and application of remote viewing techniques, particularly ARV, in practical domains. However, they also highlight the need for further research to understand the variables influencing the success and reliability of Associative remote

viewing methodology. As extensively outlined in Tressoldi and Katz's (2023) systematic review, ARV is only one of many remote viewing designs. Remote Viewing encompasses a wide range of procedures for a wide range of purposes. These include methods for detecting extrasensory information from personal mental content, techniques for assisting remote viewers, and strategies for evaluating extrasensory information to identify the target. Unfortunately, the limited number of experimental studies available prevented direct comparisons among these various procedures.

The meta-analysis by Tressoldi and Katz (2023) thus provides a quantitative update of currently available experimental results, and further research is required to enable experimentally verified comparisons of approaches. While waiting for enough studies to enable such comparisons, we propose that the insights of respected experts in the field of remote viewing could offer a valuable and provisional alternative. In the future, it should be possible to relate expert views to experimental data, and such comparison will be most valuable. However, the purpose of the current study is not to validate or challenge expert perspectives using experimental findings but to explore the landscape of expert thought in the field of remote viewing. Our goal is to map the range of perspectives and highlight areas of convergence and divergence. This is a foundational step in qualitative inquiry, especially in disciplines where empirical data is limited, inconsistent, or under-theorized. As qualitative scholars such as Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Creswell and Poth (2018) have emphasized, the value of expert perspectives lies in their capacity to generate hypotheses, guide research agendas, and provide experiential insights that are often missing from strictly empirical studies. While integration with experimental literature is a worthwhile direction for future mixed-methods or quantitative follow-ups, it is beyond the scope of this initial exploratory study. Even if there are many books on how to use RV (e.g., Katz & Knowles, 2021; McMoneagle, 2013; Moorehouse, 2007; Smith, 2014, 2015; Targ, 2004), as far as we know, this is the first semi-structured interview to a pool of renown experts.

METHODS

Twenty-four renowned experts in remote viewing, selected by their contribution to the study and the application of such techniques, were invited to participate in an online survey.

To mitigate the possibility of choosing experts simply because of their name recognition, popularity, or self-promotional abilities, we employed the following criteria for selecting experts: They needed to have overseen numerous remote viewing projects over a period of at least 5 years (although most had more than 10 years of experience managing RV projects). They had to have published their methods and results in either peer reviewed journals, professional industry magazines, or scholarly books and to have discussed their work at conferences and in video interviews. They were preselected through a process of snowball sampling and known to the researchers to have worked with many participants over time and across multiple projects. These remote viewing projects could be of an experimental nature or an applied nature but ones using careful scientific protocols such as blinding procedures, separation of roles, and randomization techniques.

The instructions were as follows: "According to your expertise in remote viewing, what are the best procedures and conditions for obtaining the best results with clairvoyance (defined here as present-time intuitive functioning) and precognition (defined as future-based) tasks?" After a response example, they were requested to write their recommendations related to participants' characteristics, the environment where the remote viewing task will take place, and overall procedures and design considerations.

To analyze the survey data, we employed thematic analysis within the methodological framework of grounded theory, as articulated by Braun and Clarke (2006). This approach facilitated the systematic and inductive identification of salient patterns, themes, and concepts emerging from the dataset. Grounded theory provided a flexible yet rigorous framework, enabling the development of insights grounded in the participants' narratives rather than shaped by a priori assumptions. Thematic analysis was carefully applied to ensure that the resulting themes were both credible and richly reflective of participants' lived experiences. This methodology is widely recognized for its capacity to generate in-depth qualitative insights while maintaining high standards of analytical rigor (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

RESULTS

Respondents

Eleven experts (45.8%) responded to our invitation. Eight filled in the survey, and the remaining three sent

their recommendations by email. Their names are as follows in alphabetical order: Tom Atwater, Gail Husick, J.D., Jon Knowles, Debra Lynne Katz, Ph.D., Joe McMoneagle, Julia Mossbridge, Ph.D., Maximilian Müller, Ph.D., Erich Schöne, Stephan Schwartz, Daz Smith, and Angela Thompson-Smith, Ph.D. Since the authors believe that it is important to allow readers to know whose expertise is drawn upon for purposes of credibility and for purposes of acknowledging the experts' contributions to remote viewing, these individuals' consent to have their names used in this paper was requested and received.

Additionally, we had in our possession an original, unpublished document written by Ingo Swann, who coined the term "remote viewing" with other researchers at the ASPR in the early 1970s (Swann, 1993a). Swann would go on to work as a contract viewer and researcher at Stanford Research Institute from 1972 to the mid-1980s, at which point he obtained a governmental contract to develop and train other personnel in *Controlled Remote Methodology* (Katz, 2021). In this document, Swann (1993b) addressed similar questions as those presented in our survey, so we took the liberty of incorporating his responses from this document into our survey.

All experts have experience managing remote viewing projects for both applied and operational projects. Nine of the 11 are expert or professional-level remote viewers themselves. Ten out of 11 have over 10 years of remote viewing experience, with half having at least 20 years of experience. Ten have published experimental write-ups in industry magazines or books, and six have published in formal journals. All have also served as research participants themselves.

Preliminary Statements by Respondents

Several experts offered overall thoughts that were relevant to this study. Daz Smith stated, "In all honesty, it comes down to individual talent, not procedure, environment, or any other ritual." Conversely, Katz placed more emphasis on the importance of sound procedures, asserting:

If you are going to do it, do it right. If at any point you have the thought that something isn't ideal but that it's just the way it has been done before or that it's all you have time, energy, or money for—then stop right there, abandon that

thought, and if you can't do that, then you might as well give up the idea of doing the project at all. There are enough studies out there with mediocre results due to this type of attitude.

Joe McMoneagle stated:

More important than any other thing one could speak to in remote viewing is—there are only two protocols for remote viewing projects. Both were written at SRI International in the beginning of the 1970s; one is straight up for just remote viewing, and that is a remote viewing protocol. The other protocol is for ARV, or Associative Remote Viewing protocol, that is only used to address binary, forced-choice questions, like Yes/No, Buy or Do Not Buy, etc.

Jon Knowles said:

I feel the absence of experience by researchers in doing remote viewing has led to more than a few bad experiences by viewers and leads to research that is out of touch with what's been learned by viewers and project managers over the last 28 years. Julia Mossbridge, Ph.D., is a rare model of combining both skills. It does appear that (in regular RV) targets/projects that have a distinct personal, group, or other 'real world' meaning get better results. Parapsychological researchers are at a disadvantage, in my opinion.

A few experts stated their experience centered more so on managing applied or operational projects rather than formal research projects. Atwater said, "I don't really do clairvoyant tasks much, except as training exercises in classes and such," and Husick stated, "My responses in this questionnaire relate to the type of operational client projects done at the Husick Group, LLC, and may or may not be applicable to other contexts."

Remote Viewing Participants' Characteristics

Training and Experience

Experts such as Daz Smith, Husick, Knowles, Müller, and Swann stressed the importance of using viewers with training and experience. Some expressed this preference in general terms: "experienced viewers with a good track record" (Knowles), "the highest possible number of practice

hours or practice sessions" (Müller). Others were more specific: "trained through the advanced level" (Husick), "people with at least a year's experience in remote viewing" (Daz Smith).

One expert also suggested that the viewers' training should include the ability "to write a full session and summary—clearly" (Daz Smith).

It was also suggested that the viewers' experience needs to be current: "Participating viewers should be maintaining their skills on a current basis through regular practice and project participation," said Husick. Current experience may also involve a rotation of assignment types. She added:

Ideally, viewers should be given a variety of assignment types over time. A steady diet of a particular type of target (only missing person cases, only near-future event targets, only business-enterprise projects, etc.) can create its own form of pollution, even if a viewer is technically blind to a specific target.

Swann wrote:

The problem involved here is the signal-to-noise ratio, and extensive experimentation through the years and in several laboratories showed that the signal ratio in untrained viewers was only 20 percent or less at best, while it can be elevated to 75 percent or more via training.... Only trained viewers are tutored to discriminate between the 'overlays' of their imaginative processes and the more important 'signals' incoming via less-noise-cluttered subliminal or pre-conscious processes (Swann, 1993b, p. 3).

Viewer Methodology

Some experts did not express a preference that the viewers use a particular methodology: "Viewers will use their own methods, cooldown as they prefer, etc." (Knowles), while others expressed the opposite opinion. Husick wrote:

Ideally, participating remote viewers are trained through the advanced level in a structured methodology.... At the Husick Group LLC, the methodology used is Controlled Remote Viewing (CRV). I have also seen good results from groups using other structured

methodologies, such as HRVG [Hawaii Remote Viewers' Guild]. Natural psychics working outside of a structured methodology may also produce good results, although it may be more difficult to communicate assignments to them using the vocabulary and tools available in a structured methodology, and it may be more difficult for an analyst to glean as much data from their work as compared to the work of someone using the structured methodology with which the analyst is familiar.

Müller agreed, stating, "The viewers should be trained in a structured method such as the CRV protocol, whose inherent structure can generate easily evaluable data."

Personal Characteristics

Multiple experts mentioned personal characteristics of successful remote viewers (Thompson-Smith, Atwater, Knowles, Mossbridge, Müller, and Schöne). The broadest perspective was provided by Atwater ("Anyone can do this"), but he also stressed, "An open mind is essential. Someone who truly believes that clairvoyance is real will get better results."

Several experts spoke in terms of the viewer's ability to distinguish between different mental states, such as "the ability to see past the stream of thought" (Schöne). Müller wrote:

The most important criterion here is the viewer's awareness of his or her own mental processes. The viewer must be able to differentiate target information from mental noise and know himself well to be able to clearly report how mental images are constructed and how he interprets them.

Others spoke in terms of the cognitive/emotional styles of the viewers, saying that they should be "calm and relaxed, even in emergency tasking. 'In the Zone'" (Thompson-Smith) or "more focused on events, objects, and processes than people. Less empathic, more structured" (Mossbridge). One expert noted the level of enthusiasm the viewers have for the task: "Prefer viewers who are keen on doing the project or target" (Knowles).

Schöne stated that ideal viewers should be able to produce "deep meditative states of contemplation on demand." Schwartz wrote, "Of all the things that you can do to make yourself a better remote viewer, nothing will serve you as well as developing the practice of meditation"

(Schwartz, n.d., p. 76). Müller pointed out difficulties that could affect results:

Variables that are dependent on fluctuations such as health, mood, and motivation should be as neutral as possible. Minor deviations from a neutral state are not detrimental to the validity of a session. If major deviations such as mental health problems are identified before a session, these must be resolved beforehand or at least put aside for the session in order to guarantee a valid attempt. Viewers should always be blind to the specific target.

Relationship to Analyst

Some experts also focused on the need for the project manager to have knowledge of the viewers. Knowles stated, "It is best if the viewer's session characteristics are known to the project manager or analyst." Husick wrote, "Familiarity with a participating viewer's previous work will aid the analyst in interpreting results, as will information regarding the viewer's track record of accuracy and areas of strengths/weaknesses." Husick suggested that it is beneficial if "the analyst is trained and experienced in the same methodology as the one being used by the viewers."

Recruiting Viewers

Finally, some thoughts were offered on the recruiting of viewers. Katz stated, "Remote viewing is a skill. Unless you wish to test brand new participants for a particular reason, there is no reason to not use experienced viewers." She continues:

If you wish to have experienced viewers, recruit from remote viewing organizations and social media platforms. If you put out a general call for remote viewers, don't leave it up to potential participants to understand what remote viewing is, but make sure you provide a definition and then create an initial set of qualifying questions to ensure they truly are experienced in remote viewing.

She also warned:

There will be some who affirmatively respond to 'Do you have remote viewing experience?' Some mean that during their lives they have had spontaneous visions of distant places or objects or people. Some may be intuitive in

other areas, such as mediumship or dowsing. Therefore, they should be asked specifically if they have done remote viewing of physical objects and locations or photographs and have recorded these through sketching and writing procedures.

She continued:

In order to determine if the participants meet the criteria you are seeking, have them complete a survey.... In addition to polling them on the above-mentioned characteristics, it is suggested you ask them to explain the methods they have been trained in, the methods they use now (don't assume they are the same), and possibly the instructors they have learned from. This data could be valuable for both ensuring they are qualified for the study and for future evaluation.

Husick stated:

The pool of viewers considered for participation in a project consists of individuals who were recommended to the Husick Group by their RV trainer or other trusted person in the RV community who is familiar with their work and who have worked on enough practice targets with me that their skill level is known to me.

The Remote Viewing Environment

Some experts, such as Daz Smith, Husick, and Knowles, believe that remote viewing can take place anywhere and that the environment doesn't really matter. One proposed that no specific environment would be needed since "anywhere should be OK to remote view" (Daz Smith). Others thought the decision was best left up to the viewers based on their experience. "Experienced viewers know how they work best, so I leave decisions about when and where to do a session to the individual viewer" (Husick). "It is up to what good, experienced viewers wish to use. Generally, this involves a meditative cooldown, often with hemisynch type soundtracks and a quiet place to do the session" (Knowles).

Many experts focused on the benefits of quiet and non-distracting environments (Thompson-Smith, Atwater, Mossbridge, Müller, Schöne, and Schwartz). "The environment should be spare, without much stimulation

in any sensory modality" (Mossbridge). Specific suggestions included: "Turn off the phone. Have all supplies ready before starting" (Thompson-Smith). Müller stated:

An experimental setting in a low-stimulus, neutral environment should be provided. If there is an experimenter or other people in the room, they should fade into the background so that a viewer can fully concentrate on his session. In general, there should be no external distractions, such as a smartphone, during a session. This can best be checked in the laboratory.

Schwartz suggested that the environment should be "a place which is not too visually busy, nor one that has noticeable odors or recurring sounds" (p. 68).

It also was suggested that certain specific features of the environment may be helpful if they are meaningful to the viewer: "Image fixations such as candles, fire, darkening, ritual actions, or ritual objects to which a meaning is attributed for the enabler of powers seem helpful. For example, placing attention in a round glass ball" (Schöne).

While Swann didn't mention the environment in the document we examined for this project, it should be noted he wrote several memos detailing his vision for an ideal environment for remote viewers that included a sparse, bland, clean environment, neutral colors, and being free from all distractions, including material and human. His instructions were closely followed in the designing of the offices located at Fort Meade Army Base, where the remote viewers, including his students, would go on to do their remote viewing sessions for numerous military and governmental law enforcement agencies (Ingo Swann Research Fellowship, n.d.; Smith, 2005).

Remote Viewing Procedure

When it comes to the procedure to be used in a remote viewing tasking, Schwartz stated, "Keep the experiment logistics as simple as possible, involving the fewest number of people to accomplish all the required tasks" (p. 166).

Another expert commented that "participants ought to be surrounded by compassion and love during the process" (Mossbridge). Similarly, Katz stated,

Participants prefer to work with a researcher that is competent, friendly, helpful, relaxed, encouraging, and warm as opposed to one that is skeptical, uncaring, hurried, stressed, or

grumpy. However, in remote viewing studies, there is of course the intuitive aspect. Viewers both tend to have thinner boundaries, so they may be particularly sensitive to a skeptical, angry researcher.... It is not only imperative this applies to the researchers involved, especially those interfacing with the viewers, but I'd go as far as to say everyone in the project should be ones who have a balanced but positive attitude and expectation for the outcome. Also, they should at all times be honest with the viewer. If something has gone wrong with a trial, they should let the viewer know this. This is because viewers are not only intuitive during the session, but also throughout the entire process. If a researcher is hiding something from them, they may not know the details, but subconsciously the viewer will pick this up and start to feel and exhibit distress.

Multiple Viewers

Several experts mentioned benefits in the use of multiple viewers in a project (Daz Smith, Husick, Katz, Knowles, Müller, Schwartz, Swann). It was felt that the use of multiple viewers also "helps with consensus data" (Daz Smith), and it was said that "the more viewers independently work on the same target, the higher the density of available information" (Müller).

One expert specifically recommended a "team of 3 to 5 viewers" (Knowles). Another spoke in larger terms: "Overall, in a project, several teams consisting of viewers and monitors should generate data, all of which come together under one project manager" (Müller). Schwartz stated, "Have multiple viewers each working with their own target set and look for consensus" (p. 161).

One expert stressed special precautions to be taken when using several viewers: "Where multiple viewers are working on the same project, they work independently of each other and are not informed of the identities of the other viewer participants while the viewing phase of the project is underway" (Husick). This would help facilitate blinding (see below).

Swann stated:

In the professional sense, the data yields of a remote viewing attempt must come from two or more viewers, not essentially to arrive at a consensus of them, but in that different viewers

provide different kinds of data or different emphases of them. Where the combined data of a number of viewers agree is important, but where the data disagree may be equally important. (Swann, 1993b, p. 3)

Target Selection/Definition

A key part of a project is the selection and definition of the target. How this is done varies depending on whether the project is operational or non-operational.

Non-Operational Targets

When it comes to non-operational targets, Mossbridge recommended:

The target should be selected in an empty room where a computer runs software randomly selecting a target and displaying it (whether video or photo—if video, sound is turned off). The information about which target is selected is recorded during the time of target selection, but this computer has no Bluetooth or Wi-Fi access at the time of target selection, and no one is in the room to see the target.

Another stated, "Overall, viewers often do tend to do well [on targets] that have distinct colors, movement, numinosity, entropy, action, and distinctive shapes" (Katz). She added:

If there is something confusing or unrecognizable about a photo when looking at it with your eyes open, then viewers will likely have a hard time as well. Alternatively, if you wish to only have a 2-D image that is fine but then use a drawing, and let the viewers know in advance this will not be present in real space, only on paper or conceptual.

On the use of video targets, Katz stated:

Videos can consist of images from real-life locations and objects (3-D), or they can be animated and artificially constructed (2-D). They should be just a short clip, not too broad, and if they are found online, such as on YouTube, they should not ever contain any ads (ads change every time a video is replayed). Video clips can be silent or include sound or music to add more potential features for viewers to perceive and describe.

Operational Targets

When it comes to an operational target, one expert stated, “The project manager crafts and documents the target definition in consultation with the client” (Husick). She further recommended that

To the extent possible, the target is defined in such a way that there is one, and only one, correct answer. For instance, where the target is the location of a missing person, the target definition should include not only the name of the missing person but also a specific date and time. By narrowing the target definition in this way, meaningful patterns are more likely to emerge from the work of multiple viewers, as compared to a situation where each viewer may be describing where the missing person is at a different date and time than the other viewers.

Husick also stressed that

The target definition should be free of unverified assumptions. For instance, ‘the person who abducted missing person Suzy Q. Smith’ would not be a valid target definition if there is any possibility that Suzy Q. Smith left voluntarily or met some fate other than abduction. In such a case, ‘the circumstances resulting in the disappearance of Suzy Q. Smith’ would be a better target definition.

Schwartz commented that, in research, “viewers seemed to be particularly good at describing targets when some kind of energetic change was taking place” (p. 102). “So, to give yourself the highest probability of success, pick from a sufficiently numinous target pool, a set of targets that are very orthogonally distinct, of equal entropy and numinosity” (p. 133). He also stated, “In nonlocal awareness, high emotional intensity is the key” (p. 197).

Target Sequencing

Katz called attention to the issue of the sequence in which targets are presented to viewers. She stated:

The remote viewing community is a small one; even if you keep all viewers apart, they may end up discussing their targets. This means that they might inadvertently expose the wrong target to each other as viewer feedback, which could lead to displacement, or it could give a clue to the

viewer about a future target they might receive. Also, it’s going to be much more time-consuming for a judge to have to look at one photo, judge it against one session, then look at another photo, and judge it against another. There is also some informal data suggesting the effect of viewers all having the same photo at the same time can strengthen the effect. The key is that all viewers have to turn in their session work before even one can receive feedback, since again they could easily communicate. Processing too many different photos and transcripts per trial can be confusing, especially if the judge is assigned to more than one viewer. So because it can get really chaotic, and due to the power of the intuitive effect of everyone getting the same photo at the same time, I’m in favor of this—as long as no one gets feedback till everyone is done.

Katz also acknowledged that some parapsychologists who serve as referees for papers express concern about *the stacking effect* (Thouless & Brier, 1970) which was a concept more relevant to forced-choice experiments involving multiple back-to-back trials. She has found that using wording in write-ups that demonstrate the authors who first introduced the concept of the stacking effect later would go on to say a project should not be disqualified for giving all viewers the same targets in the same order (provided the above careful procedures to ensure blindness are followed). When this wording is included in a journal submission, most referees don’t reject the paper in the way those do when this wording is not included.

Remote Viewing Protocol

When it comes to the selection of RV protocol, one expert said that it should be left up to the viewers: “The information-reception portion of the procedure should be up to each participant—they should use whatever means they want to attempt to predict a target that is simultaneously randomly selected” (Mossbridge). Similarly, Katz stated,

Don’t dictate the methods an experienced viewer uses to perform their intuitive work but rather let them use the methods they are most comfortable with. That being said, there could be some exceptions to this. First of all, you might be researching a particular method, so then you are going to want all viewers to use a

similar one. Or, you might need them to provide less pages to accommodate the needs of judges and analysts, and in this case, they could be told to do their session as they normally would but then to put it into a shorter summary with words and sketches consolidated. This is sometimes difficult for more prolific viewers initially, but I've seen them adjust quite well.

Other experts stated that it depended on the nature of the tasking (Thompson-Smith, Müller). For example, "When it comes to binary decisions, the ARV protocol can be used" (Müller).

These experts felt that, once a protocol was selected, it was important that viewers "follow protocol" (Thompson-Smith) and that "to reduce ambivalence, all participants should use the same method, e.g., the CRV protocol" (Müller).

Communications with Viewer

An important issue is the way in which project managers communicate with the viewers. This happens at different stages of the overall project.

For communications before the viewers undertake their sessions, one expert stated that "the procedure should be clear—whether it takes a video and written instructions, each participant should be well informed of the procedure and have their questions answered before attempting the task" (Mossbridge).

Another expert said that "when given their assignments, viewers are not told the target definition but are given coordinates, [any potential] frontloading, and a due date" (Husick). She continues:

The due date is for practical reasons, and I have seen no evidence that a longer due date results in better session work. Depending on the nature of the target and the needs of the client, additional requirements may be communicated with the assignment, such as a sketch of a map of a target location or the production of a timeline of a target event or sequence of events. To avoid pollution, no other information is provided to the viewer at this stage.... Similarly, it should be made clear to the viewers that accuracy is the goal. Even subtle pressure to provide a particular answer, to please the client, to confirm the expectations of the analyst or project manager, or to produce sensationalistic results can be polluting.

For communications during the data collection phase, Husick stated:

During the viewing phase of a project, all communication with the viewer is kept as neutral as possible to avoid even inadvertently leaking information that might pollute the viewer and trigger his or her imagination or analytical thought processes. For this reason, communication via e-mail is preferred to audio or visual contact. Additionally, even seemingly innocuous phrases such as 'good job' are avoided. Praise or criticism may be offered for procedural aspects of the project only (for instance, working in structure, providing a well-organized session summary, including sketches, meeting a deadline), and no comment is made on the substance of the session work.

Husick also stated:

I would also note that trust between the viewers and the project manager/analyst is important to obtaining good results. Because viewers work blind to the target, they must rely on the project manager to conduct the due diligence necessary to vet the client and the target, and they must rely on the project manager to refrain from assigning tasks that conflict with a viewer's values. Worries about whether they are being asked to violate someone's privacy, aid in an illegal or immoral endeavor, or otherwise participate in something they would object to if they knew the details can be distracting to viewers. Viewers are also dependent on the project manager to craft a valid target definition that doesn't send the viewers off on a wild goose chase or otherwise waste their time. Viewers are dependent on the analyst working professionally and not twisting or filtering the viewers' work to fit the analyst's biases. Viewers need to feel secure that their identities will not be disclosed to the client or others without their permission. To obtain accurate results, it is important that viewers record all of their perceptions, no matter how seemingly bizarre, nonsensical, or even embarrassing. Viewers are less likely to self-censor if they are confident that their work will be received and considered with respect and that they will not later be subjected to ridicule or embarrassment for something they have reported.

Blinding and Frontloading

Several experts discussed the issue of the blinding and frontloading of viewers (Husick, Katz, Knowles, and McMoneagle).

Katz stated:

Blinding will need to be defined. At the very least, the viewer and the researcher who has contact with the viewer should be blind to the entire target pool. Whoever creates the pool should be blind to the order of the targets assigned to each viewer. Judges and analysts should be blind to targets until the remote viewers have completed each trial.

Knowles stated that he prefers “viewers be completely blind to the target—told only the TRN/tag.” However, he also said, “For some operational work, minimal frontloading is okay or even necessary.”

Husick stated that

Frontloading is optional, and when used, it is neutrally worded and indicates which aspects of the target the viewer should devote his or her time and energy to (for instance, ‘the target is an event’ or ‘the target is a person’ or ‘the target is a location’).” She also stated, “To avoid the creation of a speculative feedback loop, information about the project (identity of client, target definition, etc.) is not provided to viewers until after actual [operational] feedback is available. For the same reason, viewers are not to discuss the target or share their sessions with each other until after actual [viewer] feedback has been provided.

On the other hand, McMoneagle stated that both RV and ARV protocols

dictate that all participants are totally blind to what’s being asked or targeted, and this includes anyone else present who must (also by protocol) be blind to the target as well. In training, as an example, all those trained by Ingo [Swann] have broken this protocol since Ingo always knew the target while teaching RV. They learned to read their trainer for sure but were unable to know much about the target. This is very easy to see, especially when the judge is also blind, or in the case of ARV, the [Figure of Merit, see “Judging,” below] is applied to determine the quality of ARV accuracy prior to investment.

McMoneagle also stated:

How could anyone know they are good at remote viewing if the target is known by them or anyone close to them within the process? I’ve done more than 50 (fifty) real-time demonstrations of RV live on prime-time television in seven countries, which were not only excellent but really stunned the program directors and audiences. But to this day, no one else has done a single good example of an RV within an acceptable protocol on film in front of 29 million viewers or more. In my humble opinion, if someone trains on completely unknown targets, then drawing what might be called an unknown target should be pretty easy for them if they were trained right.

Katz added:

[Edwin] May et al. published a paper [May et al., 1994] in which they described how viewers will do better if they have some idea of how simple or complex a target will be and what type of category they are dealing with. It’s therefore best to keep the target pool more homogenous.

Most trained viewers will totally do terrible in a research project if you give them a 2-D object one week and the next a real location and the next a person and the next a cartoon. They don’t know what approaches to use, and if you want to anger a viewer real fast, have them do a CRV session where they are exploring a target for an hour expecting a real location and doing movement commands and then they find out you gave them a drawing of a shoe.

Blinding also applies to researchers and judges. Katz stated:

A method will need to be used to disguise the viewers’ true identity from judges, when possible, to remove the possibility of favoritism, and to protect their anonymity per ethical regulations for working with human subjects. Assigning them code names or numbers will help with this.

Katz also stated, “Remote viewers today usually prefer to work alone, from home. They can scan their pages, upload, and email their sessions to their project manager.”

Session Advice

Several experts gave advice to be given to the viewers on how to perform their sessions during data collection (Thompson-Smith, Atwater, Schwartz). Thompson-Smith stated, "Have no investment in the outcome. Access data, record it by writing, and stay focused."

Atwater said:

Set your intent to do the tasking, repeating to yourself the words of the tasker—the Task. Take three deep breaths to start the session. When images come up related to anything you have recently experienced, or you sense these may be your logical self, trying to get info about the tasking—ignore them. When something totally illogical or surprising pops into your mind, record that immediately. Then go back to saying 'the Task' in your mind again. Repeat until you feel that you are done.

Similarly, Schwartz stated:

If you find yourself drifting and random thoughts begin to percolate up into your consciousness, it is time to take a short break. Just something to break the rhythm. Talk or do something else unrelated to the session. After a few moments, return to viewing. Say to yourself, or have the monitor say, 'Target.' Stop. Say 'Target' again. (p. 72)

Related to the theme of one's logical self-intruding, Schwartz stated, "Be like a radar sweeping the horizon. A radar does not think. It simply reports an impression. It imposes no cherished outcomes or limits as to what something should look like, smell like, or even whether it can exist" (p. 73). Schwartz also stated:

Before doing a session, many viewers find it useful to meditate or at least sit quietly for a few minutes to let the normal rhythms and stimuli of the day recede" (p. 68).

He also stated, "In addition to full-color visuals, be sure to note any smells, sounds, textures, or other experiences you associate with the target.... Just let sense impressions emerge distinctly in your mind (p. 71).

Session Scheduling and Length

Several experts commented on session scheduling and length (Katz, Müller, and Schwartz). Katz stated:

I recommend one trial per week, twice at the most. Viewers should know in advance how many [in] total they will be expected to accomplish.... Remote viewers should be allowed to take as much time as they would like to do their session. There is no reason to limit the time they have.

Katz went on to note that sometimes exceptions to this would need to be made with more trials done in a single day. For example, some projects are run by bringing groups of viewers together in person over a few days' time. In this case, they should try to have some hours in between each trial before starting another, and all efforts should be made to help them relax and have fun in between.

On the subject of session length, Schwartz stated, "This whole process should have a relaxed, informal quality to it and not take more than minutes. If you feel stressed, you're not doing it correctly—playfulness is the right frame of mind" (pp. 72-73). Müller stated, "Depending on the task and detailed requirements, it then depends on how long a session is carried out. Stage III sessions with a duration of 20-30 minutes are usually completely sufficient for proof-oriented studies to achieve good results." He went on to say:

When it comes to generating detailed information about a target, for example, as part of an operational task, sessions up to Stage VI, and ideally with a monitor, should be carried out. Here, the qualifications of the monitor, who asks the right questions, would also determine the quality of the session results. A session duration of a maximum of 60 minutes can be aimed for continuously in order to illuminate individual target aspects in detail.

Schwartz also has advice about the time of day and geomagnetic conditions for the session to be conducted: "So if you want to maximize the chance that your remote viewing session will succeed, you should do it 30 minutes either side of 1350 [local sidereal time] when the geomagnetic field is weak and quiet" (p. 96).

Reporting

Several experts gave specific input about the types of reports that should be required (Atwater, Daz Smith, and Katz). When it comes to reporting data back to the project manager, Atwater stated, "On your transcript, note the date, time, your name, and coordinate," and Daz Smith said,

"All viewing should be clearly written and supplied with a typed summary." Katz stated:

It's entirely permissible and desirable to mandate that viewers sketch the target whenever possible, as it is often their sketches that are close matches to targets even if their words are off. Some viewers need extra encouragement or training with this. If a viewer doesn't sketch out shapes and their visuals, what will happen is the judge will have to be the one to read descriptions and try to imagine or visualize what the viewer was picturing and then judge their own mental picture. This would easily be solved if the viewer provides a sketch, no matter how elementary or imperfect it may be.

She continued:

Ask viewers to provide [summaries and compilation sketches]. Let viewers work how they do, but ask them to sketch, provide summaries and compilations. If a viewer says they don't wish to sketch, tell them they can't participate then. Make it mandatory. Viewers should also be encouraged to summarize their work in the form of outline summaries, sketches, and compilation sketches, even if this is not something they typically do.... It's perfectly fine to invite the viewer to do a lengthy session. However, they should then be asked to go page by page through their transcripts and to take the words and put them into an Excel sheet-type summary. An alternative is to ask viewers to only submit the 10 to 20 words they think match with their top sketches.

Katz adds:

For judging purposes, and also for future publications and presentations, it's imperative that viewers turn in transcripts or summaries that are easy to read, high resolution, and scanned properly. Don't be afraid to tell viewers they must comply.... Remember to give remote viewers explicit instructions about how to name their attached transcript files and the file types needed. Usually having their name or a code name, the target number, the date, etc., will help stay organized. Don't be afraid to tell viewers they must comply. Advise remote

viewers to keep track of all their raw session work and summaries in a file on their desktops in case it's needed in the future.

Retasking

Three experts commented on the use of retasking as part of the project (Knowles, Husick, Müller). Knowles indicated this could be done "if needed" and should be "based on data in [the] viewer's session." Müller stated, "It can make sense to carry out further attempts at the same target based on the previous session results. The monitor decides this depending on the data, while the viewer remains blind to the target." Husick weighed in on this as well:

Retasking may be provided in cases where additional information is desired. To avoid pollution, no new information is provided to the viewer, and the re-tasking instructions are keyed off of information reported by the viewer in his or her previous session work. For instance, 'On p. 7 of your initial session, you provided a sketch of a person holding an object. For your re-tasking, describe and sketch the object in more detail.' Re-tasking should be done sparingly, as each re-tasking increases the chances that a viewer's imagination will take over and interfere with accurate data collection.

Non-Viewers (Monitors, Analysts, Project Managers)

Katz stated, "Separation of roles is done for a few reasons, but it also works in concert with randomization and blinding. Remote viewing research projects often involve" (1) a researcher who creates the target pool, (2) a researcher who communicates with the viewers, (3) judges, (4) a person assigned to randomize targets (plus someone who holds a backup of the randomization key), and (5) a statistician. Communication between these parties should be minimal or non-existent while trials are running.

Schwartz stated, "A remote viewing session can be done alone or with a monitor/interviewer.... But, and this is very important, the monitor's job is only to keep you talking and in contact with the target, not to guide what you say" (p. 74). He continued:

Monitors should practice their questions in their minds before they speak, making sure to weed out any queries that cue a particular response.... The monitor must impose no judgment on what the viewer is saying, however illogical or strange it may sound. (p. 75)

Two other experts addressed the role of project managers/analysts. Müller stated that the project manager

must identify similarities and create an overall picture in the form of a report that describes the target on several predetermined dimensions. In the end, the best possible results arise from the quantity and quality of the data as well as the goal-dependent, further explorations of individual questions relating to the given target.

Husick stated:

The analyst must be a trained and experienced viewer. However, to minimize the chance of telepathic overlay during viewing and the chance of bias during analysis, the analyst does not participate as a viewer on the same project where he or she is serving as the analyst.

Judging

Mossbridge addressed the subject of judging the viewers' results: "If this is operational, no judge is needed" since "the tasker will be the 'judge.'" On the other hand, "If judging is to be performed (if this is non-operational), ideally a non-comparative method should be used—like 'figure of merit,' for instance." McMoneagle stated:

Dr. [Edwin] May and others developed a metric called Figure of Merit (FoM), which turned out to be an excellent predictor of RV quality prior to [operational] feedback. If the FoM was above 0.452 in ARV, it almost never missed producing over 200 ROI in 20 minutes in the binary option market.

Katz said that "training and testing should be done to establish rater reliability." There is also the challenge of retaining judges during lengthy projects. Katz stated, "Judges can get burned out easily and quickly, just like viewers, so it may be best to limit the number of transcripts and trials they are scoring."

If one of the goals is to develop a sense of the reliability of individual viewers, Katz suggested that "it would be ideal to have the same judge or two per trial rate all viewers' transcripts, and then for the next trial have another judge(s)."

In some cases, viewers may provide information that cannot be judged. Katz stated: While they may then get some aspect that can't be judged,

because it is outside the parameters of what is shown in the photo, they are more likely to make stronger emotional and somatic contact with a target and get more details. Since this is a critical aspect of remote viewing, it isn't something viewers should be stopped from doing. There will be more information that can't be judged, but this can be handled by having a judging category for information that just can't be assessed. You can mitigate this by telling viewers they should try to limit explorations to the confines of the photo—not go out or too far out of that scene.

Katz also noted that

For ease of statistical calculations, the gold standard in psi experiments has been using matching tasks. This involves creating a set of photos, which includes the intended judging target and at least one other photo, although sometimes there could be as many as a dozen other photos. These photos need to be different from each other in every characteristic and of the same level of interest as each other. The more photos in the set, the less overall trials are needed to establish statistically significant results. So having two photos in a set will require more trials than if 10 photos were in a set. Once the viewer does their session, a judge chooses which is the best match out of the set. When a judge chooses the actual target as the best match, this is considered a hit.

However, she stated that due to displacement problems, "it's my recommendation that another process be used, unless there is another reason to have extra photos in the set, such as for ARV trials."

On the subject of displacement, she mentioned that a way to mitigate it is to avoid letting viewers know there will be judging performed by use of a set of photos. The downside to this is experienced viewers may assume you are using this approach, or others might become intuitively aware there are multiple 'targets' during their session.

Feedback

Feedback comes in two forms: (1) in operational sessions, feedback that may confirm or disconfirm RV results may be present after data collection (either based on what

the client knows or what is later discovered), and (2) feedback may be provided to viewers. The first may be referred to as operational feedback and the second as viewer feedback.

Ingo Swann made remarks dealing with the role of operational feedback that is present after data collection for purposes of confirmation or disconfirmation. He stated:

A 'viewing' (of a distant site or topic) cannot be said to have taken place until positive feedback indicates that it has taken place. This is the formal definition of professional remote viewing in that unless positive feedback is achieved, the 'viewing' must be held as occurring only in the mind or imagination of the alleged viewer.... Any other attribution will be considered by me as unethical. (Swann, 1993b, p. 3)

Concerning feedback provided to viewers, three experts addressed this subject (Husick, Mossbridge, and Müller). Husick said, "Once [operational] feedback is available, it is provided to participating viewers to the extent allowed by the client." Mossbridge stated, "Participants should be given feedback as to the usefulness of their sessions even if they cannot know the target." She also stated, "Ideally, conditions with target feedback and conditions without ought to be tested." And Müller affirmed, "Feedback should always take place after the evaluation for everyone involved so that they can reflect on their performance, but it is not necessary."

Schwartz stated, "Viewers do better when they get feedback than when they don't," "the closer the feedback is to the viewing, the better," and "don't show viewers the other targets" to prevent displacement (pp. 153-154). Katz added:

A trial should not ever start until the [viewer] feedback is closed out with the last [one], [which] will psychologically help them to forget one target so they can be more focused on the next.... Receiving feedback in between trials therefore closes the feedback loop so they will be less likely to displace to the target in the next trial (a phenomenon referred to as "time displacement").... Feedback photos and videos should be high resolution, larger size photos, and it's helpful to ask viewers to take some action that assures they have viewed and interacted with their feedback photo. This action could include asking them to sketch it or

to comment on it and send commentary back to the project manager.

Katz noted that sometimes it may not be practical to give feedback to viewers, which can cause problems if viewers assume there will be future viewer feedback and focus on it. In this case, "If they are told there is no feedback, they can modify their approach accordingly."

Ethics and Compensation

Katz focused on the compensation of viewers, which can have an impact on their morale and promote their retention in the project. She stated:

If the researchers are being paid, then the viewers should be compensated as well when possible. If funds are very limited, it helps boost morale to send them gifts halfway through the trials, such as snacks. Also having meetings where viewers get to meet each other after the project, such as through an online party, could help boost morale.

Compensation can also be provided in the form of public acknowledgment. Katz stated:

Psychological research ethics dictate that participants should be anonymous, and their data protected.... Some remote viewers are just fine with anonymity. However, many others see this as unfair and will want to be at least acknowledged as having worked on the project by having their names listed within any write-up or presentation. Their attitude is, why should the researchers get acknowledged and receive the benefits of publication—but not themselves, when remote viewing is time-consuming and hard work? This is especially true for those who have already paid their dues in practice time and consider themselves professionals.... This acknowledgment, or potential for acknowledgment, will also, in a very small way, serve as some compensation for their time. This can be done without attaching their names to the data, although occasionally a viewer may have done extraordinarily well across an entire study and would benefit from revelation of their statistics or accomplishments. Participation agreements could include the option of allowing viewers to choose the level or kind of acknowledgement

they wish to receive after project is completed and their own personal results are known.

Disclosure

Katz felt that in addition to compensation and acknowledgment, disclosure was an important ethical practice in remote viewing experiments. She said:

It is essential that viewers are given full disclosure of what their transcripts will be used for. They also have a right to know their funding source and whether this source will be receiving their transcripts or copies of their transcripts, and if so, what is the reason behind this. For research-based projects, viewers should be able to keep copies of their own transcripts and viewer feedback materials and to freely share these once the project is completed. For applied or operational projects there may be more restrictions to protect the identity and privacy of clients.

Precognitive Tasking

Precognitive Participants' Characteristics

Multiple experts indicated that they thought the same characteristics for viewers that applied to clairvoyant tasking also applied in precognitive taskings (Thompson-Smith, Atwater, Daz Smith, Husick, Knowles, and Müller).

Thompson-Smith also stated that it was important that they "have no expectations" and are "open to receive data." Knowles also added, "I prefer to work alone for alphanumeric targets" but would apply the same criteria as he gave for clairvoyantly tasked viewers if working with a team.

Some experts thought that the differences should be more substantial for precognitively tasked viewers. For example, while Mossbridge stated clairvoyantly tasked viewers should be more focused on events, objects, and processes than people and be more structured and less empathic, she said that for precognitively tasked viewers, they should "have high emotional intelligence, be connected to people more than things/events, and have a positive, loving outlook" (Mossbridge). On his part, Schöne stated that, for precognitively tasked viewers, they should have

[the] ability to perceive thoughts from the observer's perspective over a longer period

of time, mindfully slowing down physical and mental processes, willpower to hold concentration, [the] ability to (re)bring concentration to one point and hold it there, [and the] ability to let go of mental concepts and mentally go empty into a follow-up step.

Precognitive Environment

Mossbridge stated that "the environment should be exactly what makes each participant feel comfortable." However, some made more specific recommendations. Thompson-Smith stressed the need for minimal distractions, as she had for clairvoyant taskings, but added "OBE-like zone to allow bilocation/time jump." Schöne stated that the precognitive environment should contain "light natural sounds, by no means quiet or soundproof. From my experience, the mind needs a point of contemplation while the attention catches the impression that does not belong to the environment."

Precognitive Procedure

Several experts stated that the same factors they recommended for clairvoyant tasking also applied to precognitive tasking (Thompson-Smith, Daz Smith, Husick, and Mossbridge). Other experts recommended ARV for precognitive tasking (Atwater, Katz, and Knowles). Atwater stated:

Associative Remote Viewing is what I do for precognition. [The] procedure is basically the same, except the time you need to spend in session is usually much less, since the tasking is only to differentiate between two targets. I would use someone else's software to pick the targets and track the data for long-term tasks. Currently participating in testing Greg Kolodziejzyk's new ARV system that uses AI for judging; looks promising; looking forward to using it for my own predictions.

Knowles stated:

For ARV, prefer Unitary ARV protocol. Especially, have a tight team, strict division of labor, no crosstalk about sessions or events before or after [the] event, [the] viewer receives one photo only as FB [i.e., feedback], and enhanced feedback (even a FB session). Don't do too much ARV. Take breaks (days). Solo work in ARV: I use automatic writing, visualization, immediate knowledge ('thought'), [and] visit a

virtual scene. Have had marked lottery success with this approach on small lotteries (Pick 3 and Pick 4).

Katz also noted that ARV projects involving multiple viewers may require a modification to the judging procedure: "If multiple viewers' transcripts are being aggregated into a single prediction per trial, there should be a decision made up front about how to handle situations where predictions contradict each other—such as to call a pass."

Katz affirmed that "displacement has been a huge factor in ARV and provided a list of strategies to mitigate this risk. First, she suggested not exposing viewers to both judging photos and the prediction, or to the judging process itself, emphasizing that viewers do not need to know the identities of the judges. Additionally, viewers should not be exposed to the wagering or the outcome of the event, except in monthly or biannual reports or upon request. Viewer feedback should only consist of receiving the photo, without discussing the event, money made or lost, or any other related topics.

Katz also advised against having viewers watch the game/event or even be aware of it and recommends limiting the number of targets to avoid overloading viewers in a single day. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that viewers receive large, clear, high-resolution feedback photos and have a way to verify that they actually spent time with them. Moreover, Katz encouraged viewers to do nothing else during feedback time but focus solely on the photo to prevent any interference from their own lives. She also suggests that the photos should be engaging for the viewers, considering personal interests such as gender, and that the judging of photos should be balanced in this regard.

To maintain clarity, Katz advised that those involved in judging and wagering should keep their roles separate and refrain from getting excited about the results until the entire event is concluded. She also stresses the need to ignore non-actualized photos entirely treating them as if they never existed.

Regarding wagering on future predictions, Katz also advised following a modest system, suggesting that for projects involving repeated trials, attempting to meet statistical goals, wagers should be modest, with an example of a \$40 wager.

Lastly, viewers should either meditate in advance or ensure they are in a good, focused, well-rested, and stress-free state, both internally and externally, before engaging with the process. Müller stated that

the same applies to targets in the future as to targets in the present. Fluctuations on the timeline, i.e., changes that can occur during the time duration between sessions and the target point in time, must be taken into account (probabilistic future). If necessary, factors that could lead to a change and their likelihood of occurring can be queried in the session in order to get a clearer picture.

And Schöne stated that "protocol-based procedures, drawing, or writing support the distraction of the thinking mind. In this sense, it could also be rhythmic sounds; my perception tells me that these things enable more psychic functions."

DISCUSSION

Our survey of remote viewing experts revealed a wide range of perspectives on best practices in both applied and experimental contexts. These should be viewed as informed opinions rather than established facts, as not all recommendations are strongly supported by empirical data.

For example, Schwartz as an expert noted the potential benefits of conducting remote viewing sessions during specific local sidereal times (LST). This idea stems from a study by his colleague, James Spottiswoode, who analyzed 1,468 free response trials and found a statistically significant correlation between LST and effect size, with a peak around 13.5 hours—suggesting a possible cosmo-physical influence on psi functioning (Spottiswoode, 1997). However, in a follow-up study, Spottiswoode and Edwin May reanalyzed additional datasets and failed to replicate the LST correlation, raising questions about the robustness and generalizability of the original finding (Spottiswoode & May, 1997).

Some of our surveyed experts expressed a preference for viewers trained in Controlled Remote Viewing (CRV). Despite its popularity, there remains a lack of empirical research directly comparing the efficacy of CRV with other remote viewing methodologies. To date, few methodological studies have systematically tested whether CRV yields more accurate or reliable results than alternative approaches, leaving this an open question in the field.

Displacement effects, defined as using psi to accurately describe something other than the target such as the next target in a series, or a decoy photo in a judging set, or a photo that the project manager has taped to their computer, was

another common theme, referenced by Katz and others. Although a wide array of concerns about displacement date back to psi research in the 1940s (Katz & Knowles, 2021), contemporary empirical studies explicitly focused on this issue remain limited. Julie Milton's doctoral dissertation found mixed evidence supporting displacement as a consistent explanatory factor (Milton, 1997), though many researchers, project managers, practitioners, instructors and students continue to cite anecdotal evidence for its occurrence, and members of the *Society for Scientific Exploration* and the *International Remote Viewing Association* are currently exploring this through methodological research that will soon be completed.

Despite the current lack of definitive empirical support for some of the views expressed, we argue that these expert insights—rooted in years of applied practice, experimental observation, and professional collaboration—offer valuable contributions to the ongoing development of remote viewing protocols. Their perspectives reflect the diversity of approaches within the broader remote viewing community, which includes researchers, operational project managers, and practitioners.

We observed that many expert comments were complementary, while others reflected diverging views. Rather than seeing these differences as problematic, we interpret them as indicative of the complex and evolving nature of remote viewing research and practice. The collective observations offered through this survey can serve as a constructive guide for those involved in both applied and experimental remote viewing investigations.

LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations to this study. First, the sample size was relatively small, consisting of 11 participants. While each participant was recognized as an expert in remote viewing project management, their professional focuses varied. Some specialize in operational or client-based projects, while others conduct formal experiments intended for publication in peer-reviewed journals; a few do both.

Given these differences, it may have been useful to develop two separate questionnaires tailored to each group. Some of the divergent responses may reflect this distinction. For example, project managers focused on real-world applications (e.g., locating missing persons or pets) may require viewers to engage in longer, more detailed sessions, while experimental researchers may need only brief, targeted descriptions to enable blind judging of image sets.

As far as our research methodology, while thematic analysis is a widely accepted and flexible method in qualitative research, it carries inherent limitations. One key concern is the potential for subjectivity in interpreting data. Researchers may unintentionally bring their own biases or preconceptions into the identification of themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In this study, we attempted to mitigate subjectivity through reflective practice and researcher triangulation.

Some of the experts cited in this study are also the authors of prior studies, such as those cited in the meta-analysis by Tressoldi and Katz (2023). This carries with it a risk of circularity whereby their own studies reinforce the views they express here rather than fostering broader consideration. While these experts may not fully represent all experts in the field, the recommendations they provide here are also based on their personal experience and not simply on the experimental validation of their statements, which partially mitigates this risk.

Another limitation of the present study is that we allow the experts to present their views without detailed cross-examination, in keeping with the nature of an opinion survey. As such, there are risks of observer/experimenter bias, Type I errors in qualitative inference, and ideological trends. Consequently, the views expressed here should not be treated as absolute truths but as informed opinions that may be useful in practical situations and that can serve as points of departure for future research and discussion.

IMPLICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

It is important to recognize that in older remote viewing studies emphasizing quantitative designs, critical contextual variables—such as the viewer's background, personal techniques, and phenomenological experiences—were often omitted or underexplored. Yet these factors may play an essential role in shaping performance and outcomes. We encourage both researchers and journal editors to support more comprehensive reporting of methodologies employed not only by the researchers but by the participants themselves and to include thoughtful discussion of individual differences and experiential dimensions even if this means making exceptions for lengthier papers and higher word counts. This survey is intended as a catalyst for dialogue around best practices in remote viewing research. By sharing these expert insights, we hope to foster greater methodological transparency, encourage interdisciplinary rigor, and support the continued evolution of remote viewing as both a scientific and applied discipline.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Jimmy Akin (ORCID: 0009-0007-8273-6554): Formal Analysis, Writing—Original Draft, Writing—Review & Editing.

Patrizio Tressoldi (ORCID: 0000-0002-6404-0058): Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing—Original Draft.

Debra Lynne Katz (ORCID: 0000-0001-9109-4759): Writing—Original Draft, Writing—Review & Editing, Project Administration.

REFERENCES

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J., & Poth, C. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Ingo Swann Research Fellowship. (n.d.). Irvine Sullivan Ingram Library's Special Collections, University of West Georgia. Ingo Swann Research Fellowship | UWG.
- International Remote Viewing Association. (n.d.). *What is remote viewing*. Retrieved February 28, 2025, from <https://www.irva.org>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(85\)90062-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(85)90062-8)
- Katz, D. L. (2021). Fridays with Ingo: Ingo Swann: Scientist and psychic. *Mindfield, 13*(2). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357477707_Fridays_with_Ingo_Swann_Scientist_and_Psychic
- Katz, D. L., & Knowles, J. (2021). *Associative remote viewing: The art and science of predicting outcomes for sports, politics, finances, and the lottery*. Living Dreams Press.
- Katz, D. L., & Tressoldi, P. (2022). Remote viewing applications: A survey of present-day RV practitioners. *The Journal of Parapsychology, 86*(1), 135–157. <https://doi.org/10.30891/jopar.2022.01.07>
- Katz, D. L., Bulgatz, M. F., & McLaughlin-Walter, N. (2017). Predicting the 2016 U.S. presidential election: Using a double blind associative remote viewing protocol. **eight martinis, 15*, 4–15. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317341992_Predicting_the_2016_US_Presidential_Election
- May, E. C., Spottiswoode, S. J. P., & James, C. L. (1994). Managing the target-pool bandwidth: Possible noise reduction for anomalous cognition experiments. *Journal of Parapsychology, 58*(3), 303–313. <https://www.jsasoc.com/docs/Target-bandwidth.pdf>
- McMoneagle, J. (2013). *Remote viewing secrets: A handbook*. Crossroad Press.
- Milton, J. (1997). Displacement in psychic guessing: An overview and an example of its relevance to the I Ching. *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research, 62*(850), 246–256.
- Moorehouse, D. (2007). *Remote viewing: The complete user's manual for coordinate remote viewing*. Sounds True.
- Schwartz, S. (n.d.). *Remote viewing: The Art and Science of Nonlocal Awareness*. Also published as *Opening to the Infinite*. (2007, 3rd ed.). Nemoseen Media.
- Smith, C. C., Laham, D., & Moddel, G. (2014). Stock market prediction using associative remote viewing by inexperienced remote viewers. *Journal of Scientific Exploration, 28*(1). <https://journalofscientificexploration.org/index.php/jse/article/view/608>
- Smith, D. (Ed.). (2014). *CRV: Controlled remote viewing*. Daz Smith.
- Smith, P. (2005). *Reading the enemy's mind: Inside star gate: America's Psychic Espionage Program*. Forge Books.
- Smith, P. (2015). *The essential guide to remote viewing: The secret military remote perception skill anyone can learn*. Intentional Press.
- Spottiswoode, S. J. P. (1997). Apparent association between effect size in free response anomalous cognition experiments and local sidereal time. *Journal of Scientific Exploration, 11*(2), 109–122. <https://www.jsasoc.com/docs/JSE-LST.pdf>
- Spottiswoode, S. J. P., & May, E. C. (1997). Testing the correlation of psi performance with local sidereal time. *Journal of Scientific Exploration, 11*(2), 123–130. <https://www.jsasoc.com/docs/JSE-LST.pdf>
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. SAGE Publications.
- Swann, I. (1993a). On remote viewing, UFOs, and extraterrestrials. *Fate Magazine, 46*(9), 73–82.
- Swann, I. (1993b). [Unpublished manuscript]. Cover document written to Messrs. Joe Stefula and Richard Butler, containing an assessment of three remote viewers' transcripts from the Roswell case. [Private correspondence obtained and provided by Daz Smith to present to researchers.]
- Targ, R. (2004). *Limitless mind: A guide to remote viewing and the transformation of consciousness*. New World Library.
- Thouless, R. H., & Brier, R. M. (1970). The stacking effect & methods of correcting for it. *Journal of Parapsychology, 34*(2), 124–128.

- Tressoldi, P., & Katz, D. L. (2023). Remote viewing: A 1974-2022 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 37(3), 467–489. <https://doi.org/10.31275/20232931>
- Utts, J. (1996). *An assessment of the evidence for psychic functioning*. Report prepared for the U.S. Government. <https://www.ics.uci.edu/~jutts/air.pdf>

