SRI International

November 1978   (REVISED)

STANDARD REMOTE-VIEWING PROTOCOL
(LOCAL TARGETS)

by

Harold E. Puthoff and Russell Targ

SRI International

STANDARD REMOTE-VIEWING PROTOCOL
(LOCAL TARGETS)

The basic outline of our standard remote-viewing protocol is as
given in our tutorial paper, "A Perceptual Channel for Information
Transfer over Kilometer Distances: Historical Perspective and Recent
Research," H. Puthoff and R. Targ, Proc. IEEE, pp. 329-354, March 1976.[1]
The elements of the protocol, each of which is addressed below, consist
of (1) target pool selection; (2) subject orientation; (3) outbound
experimenter behavior; (4) inbound experimenter behavior; (5) post-
experiment feedback; (6) judging procedure.

1.   Target Pool Selection

To carry out an experimental series of, say, n trials with a
subject, a list of targets $\gg$ n should be prepared in advance by an
experimenter who will not interact with the subject after that. The
targets should be chosen to be distinctive, but not necessarily distinct
from each other; that is, rather than just a collection of nondescript
street corners one should select bridges, towers, fountains, gardens,
plazas, etc., so that a judge could in principle recognize targets on
the basis of correct but sketchy descriptions. On the other hand, once
having chosen a fountain-type target, there should be several fountain
targets; for a bridge target, several bridge targets, etc., in order to
avoid the possible subject strategy of "I had a bridge yesterday, so it
can't be a bridge today." The subject should be told explicitly that
there are similar as well as different types of targets.

When the target list is made, each target location should be
written on a card and placed in an envelope, the envelopes randomized
and numbered. These should then be stored in a secure safe or similar
container.

With regard to whether a target is replaced in the pool after use,
the preferable procedure, from a methodological standpoint, is to
replace it. (A problem with actual replacement is that the subject,

1

upon becoming aware of a mental image of a previous target, might be
biased to reject it as memory. An acceptable alternative is to replace
a used target by a new one of similar type--e.g., one fountain by
another.)

2. Subject Orientation

Before the experiment, the subject should be shown some previous
remote-viewing results with one goal in mind--to get across the idea
that one should, as nearly as possible, report raw perception rather
than analysis, since the former tends to be correct and the latter is
almost always wrong.* A subject needs to understand that a rounded piece
of blue metal is just that, and that he should not initially try to
determine what it is. Remind the subject that imagination constitutes
noise in the channel, and therefore the closer he can get to raw uninter-
preted imagery, the better. To have success in the above, the best
guideline we have found is to choose as subjects individuals who are
self-confident, uninhibited, successful, and not afraid to be wrong.
No psychological test we have investigated is as reliable as the above
subjective assessment in choosing subjects.

3. (Outbound) Experimenter Behavior

At the start of an experimental session, the inbound and outbound
experimenters and subject should rendevous for a relaxed informal dis-
cussion in the laboratory setting. (The outbound experimenter or
experimenters must not know the target at this time.) Together they
agree on a time for the subject description to start (e.g., 30 minutes
hence--the length of time required to reach the furthest target in the
pool; this time is then an invariant for all experiments.) The outbound
experimenter then leaves the laboratory, uses a random-number generating
procedure to obtain a number from 1 - n (number of targets in pool),

---

*Figures 3 and 4 in the IEEE paper[1] are good examples. In Figure 4 the
subject had absolutely no concept of a pedestrian overpass, but simply
saw a pattern of receding squares; in Figure 3 correctly-dimensioned
pools of water were misinterpreted as purification plant pools rather
than recreational swimming pools.

2

obtains the so-numbered envelope from the target pool, and leaves the
premises. (We use a Texas Instruments SR-51 hand calculator, which has
a random-number function.) After driving away from the laboratory, he
opens the envelope to determine the target, and then proceeds to that
location. He should arrange to park and then come upon the target
location at exactly the starting time so that his view of it is fresh
at the beginning of the experiment. He then simply pays attention to
the environment and does not let his mind wander (especially to another
target). It does not appear to matter how many people comprise the out-
bound team, provided they do not (1) pay attention only to each other,
or (2) scatter about. At the end of the agreed-upon target viewing time
(usually 15 minutes) they return to the lab.

No talking / or discussion of current target!

4. ⟨Inbound⟩ Experimenter Behavior

During the period that the outbound experimenters spend en route
to the target, the inbound experimenter and subject have a period to
relax and discuss the protocols. (Inbound it is best not to have addi-
tional observers.) The goal of the inbound experimenter during this
period is to make it "safe" for the subject to experience remote viewing.
For the initial orientation of a new subject, this typically includes a
low-key pep talk as to how remote viewing appears to be a natural, not
abnormal, function, that many people appear to have done it successfully,
even their first time, and always including the reminder to eschew
analysis and simply render raw impressions.

Since we think that remote viewing is a difficult task, like per-
ceiving a subliminal stimulus, we think it takes the full attentive
powers of the subject. Therefore, the environment, procedures, etc.,
should be as natural and comfortable as possible to minimize the
attention on anything other than the job at hand. No hypnosis, strobe
lights, or sensory-deprivation procedures are ever used, since in our
view these (novel) environmental factors take away some of the subject's
much-needed attention. We are in this sense proponents of a "naturalist
school." If the subject feels more comfortable smoking, or drinking a
cup of coffee, that is permitted. These should be arranged ahead of
time, however, so that neither subject nor experimenter leave the

3

experimental room while waiting for the outbound experimenter to reach his target.

The experimenter should have arranged ahead of time to have pen and paper available for drawing, and a tape recorder. When the agreed-upon experiment time arrives, the inbound experimenter simply asks the subject to "describe what impressions come to mind with regard to where the outbound experimenter is." Most subjects prefer to close their eyes, but they should simply do what comes naturally. The room lighting is preferably subdued to prevent after-image highlights, shadows on eyelids, etc. It is best that the inbound experimenter not pressure the subject to say a lot; he should act as if there is all the time in the world. Otherwise, a subject may tend to embroider descriptions just to be saying something to please the experimenter. If the subject tends toward being analytical ("I see Macy's") the experimenter must gently lead the subject into description, not analysis. ("You don't have to tell me where it is, just describe what you see,") This is the most important and difficult task of the inbound experimenter.

It is also useful for the inbound experimenter to "surprise" the subject with new viewpoints. ("Go above the scene and look down--what do you see? If you look to the left, what do you see?") The subject's viewpoint appears to shift rapidly with a question like this, and the data come through before the subject's defenses activate to block it out. The shifting of viewpoint also obviates the problem of the subject spending the entire time giving meticulous detail on a trivial item, such as a flower, which, even if true, will be of no help to a judge. Once a subject feels he sees something, he tends to hang on to this perception rather than commit himself to a new viewpoint.

The subject must be encouraged to sketch what he sees, even over his objections that he is not an artist, can't sketch, etc. He may do so throughout, or wait until the last five minutes if intermittent drawing would distract his concentration. Since drawings tend to be more accurate than verbalizations, this is an extremely important factor for good results.

4

5. Post-Experiment Feedback

When the outbound experimenter returns, the inbound and outbound experimenters and subject should proceed directly to the target for feedback. This helps to develop the subject's sense of which parts of his mental imaging are correct, versus incorrect. It completes the experiment for him, so that when he does a following experiment, his mind is not still involved with wondering how he did on the previous one. Only a very experienced subject can function well time after time without feedback, so this must be done for each experiment to ensure success.

6. Judging Procedure

In a sense, the most critical part of the remote-viewing procedure is the judging. Any single experiment in remote viewing, even if per-fect, can in principle be dismissed as possibly coincidence. Further, any result less than perfect can be dismissed as a generalized "grass is green, sky is blue" transcript that fits every target. Only blind differential discrimination across a series of targets can put these interpretations to rest.

To prepare the transcripts for judging, an experimenter not involved in judging must read the transcripts and delete from them any reference to dates or previously used targets, so that a judge could not order the transcripts chronologically or otherwise obtain a priori information useful in matching.

Two judging procedures can then be used: Direct Matching, and Rank Ordering. Both procedures assume that n experiments have been carried out and n responses obtained. The judge must then try to determine which of the n responses goes with which of the n targets.

a. Direct-Matching Procedure

The n responses (transcripts with associated drawings) are numbered in random order and given to the judge along with the list of n targets, also in a (different) random order. The key is known by an experimenter, but not the judge. The judge then visits the target sites and constructs a one-to-one correspondence list between targets and responses without replacement; that is, no target or response is used twice.

With the correspondence list and the aid of the key, the experimenter then consults the statistical table for Direct Matching (Table 1) to determine whether the result is statistically significant. For example, if there were 5 correct matches out of 9 responses, the table indicates that the probability of obtaining such a result by chance is $p = 0.003125$, or roughly 3 times out of a thousand. Since the accepted standard in behavioral research is that a result can be considered significant if one obtains the value $p \leq 0.05$, such a result would be considered significant--that is, indicative of a nonchance correspondence.

The Direct Matching procedure is the simplest to carry out, but will give no credit for a fairly good description if a judge has difficulty in choosing between two possibilities and chooses the wrong one. This procedure is thus overly conservative. The more difficult Rank Ordering procedure, described next, gives partial credit in such a case, and is therefore a more precise statistical tool for analysis of medium-grade results.

b. Rank-Ordering Procedure

In the use of the Rank-Ordering procedure, the experimenter randomizes the targets and transcripts as before. Now, however, each of n judges is given a set of the n transcripts but only one of the target sites to investigate. Each judge's task is to visit his assigned target site, read through all the transcripts, and order them best-to-worst match (1 through 5, say, if there are five targets and five transcripts).

With the aid of the key, the experimenter then adds up the rank-ordering numbers assigned to each target's associated transcript. For example, if the actual response to a target was given a first place when a judge was looking at the target, then it gets a 1. If the actual response to a target was given a third place match when a judge was looking at that target, then it gets a 3, etc. The addition of these numbers $1 + 3 + \ldots$ then yields a number called the sum of ranks. One then consults the rank-ordering table (Table 2) for the statistic of interest. For example, if there were 5 experiments (5 targets and 5 transcripts) and the sum of ranks was 9, the table for 5 X 5 gives a

6

Table 1

DIRECT MATCHING

THE PROBABILITIES OF M CORRECT MATCHES OUT OF N TARGETS

M ● N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
0	...	.5000	.3333	.3750	.36667	.368n6	.36786	.367882	.367879	.367879	.3678794	.3678794
1	1.000	...	.5000	.3333	.37500	.36667	.36806	.367857	.367882	.367879	.3678795	.3678794
2		.5000	...	.2500	.16667	.18750	.18333	.184028	.183929	.183941	.1839396	.1839397
3			.1667	...	.08333	.05556	.06250	.061111	.061343	.061310	.0613137	.0613132
4				.0417	...	.02083	.01389	.015625	.015278	.015336	.0153274	.0153284
5						.00833	...	.00417	.002778	.003125	.003056	.0030671	.0030655
6							.00139	...	.000694	.000463	.000521	.0005093	.0005112
7								.00020	...	.000099	.000066	.0000744	.0000728
8									.000025	...	.000012	.0000083	.0000093
9										.000003	...	.0000014	.0000009
10											.000000	...	.0000001
11												.0000000	...
12													.0000000

SIGNIFICANT AT p ≤ 0.05
(4 or more out of any arbitrary N)

Table 2

RANK-ORDERING TABLE

Number of Targets = 4; Number of Transcripts = 4

SUM OF RANKS	P-VALUE[*]
4	0.39063E-02
5	0.19531E-01
6	0.58594E-01
7	0.13672F 00
8	0.25781E 00
9	0.41406E 00
10	0.58594E 00
11	0.74219E 00
12	0.86328F 00
13	0.94141F 00
14	0.98047E 00
15	0.99609E 00
16	0.10000F 01

Number of Targets = 5; Number of Transcripts = 5

SUM OF RANKS	P-VALUE
5	0.32000E-03
6	0.19200E-02
7	0.67200E-02
8	0.17920E-01
9	0.40320F-01
10	0.79040F-01
11	0.13824E 00
12	0.21984E 00
13	0.32224F 00
14	0.43904E 00
15	0.56056E 00
16	0.67776E 00
17	0.78016F 00
18	0.86176E 00
19	0.92096F 00
20	0.95968E 00
21	0.98208E 00
22	0.99328E 00
23	0.99808E 00
24	0.99968E 00
25	0.10000F 01

---

[*]The notation E-02 is to be understood as 10^{-2}; E 01 as 10^{1}; etc.

8

Table 2 (Continued)

Number of Targets = 6; Number of Transcripts = 6

SUM OF RANKS	P-VALUE
6	0.21433E-04
7	0.15003E-03
8	0.60014E-03
9	0.18004E-02
10	0.45010E-02
11	0.99023E-02
12	0.19676E-01
13	0.35880E-01
14	0.60764F-01
15	0.96472E-01
16	0.14463E 00
17	0.20585E 00
18	0.27939E 00
19	0.36310E 00
20	0.45357E 00
21	0.54642E 00
22	0.63689E 00
23	0.72061E 00
24	0.79415E 00
25	0.85537E 00
26	0.90353E 00
27	0.93923E 00
28	0.96412E 00
29	0.98032E 00
30	0.99010E 00
31	0.99550E 00
32	0.99820E 00
33	0.99940E 00
34	0.99985E 00
35	0.99998E 00
36	0.10000E 01

Table 2 (Continued)

Number of Targets = 7; Number of Transcripts = 7

SUM OF RANKS	P-VALUE
7	0.12143E-05
8	0.97141E-05
9	0.43714E-04
10	0.14571E-03
11	0.40071E-03
12	0.96170E-03
13	0.20837E-02
14	0.41589E-02
15	0.77458E-02
16	0.13585E-01
17	0.22595E-01
18	0.35838E-01
19	0.54453E-01
20	0.79544E-01
21	0.11205E 00
22	0.15259E 00
23	0.20137E 00
24	0.25802E 00
25	0.32161E 00
26	0.39065E 00
27	0.46315E 00
28	0.53685E 00
29	0.60935E 00
30	0.67839E 00
31	0.74198E 00
32	0.79863E 00
33	0.84741E 00
34	0.88795E 00
35	0.92045E 00
36	0.94555E 00
37	0.96416E 00
38	0.97740E 00
39	0.98641E 00
40	0.99225E 00
41	0.99584E 00
42	0.99791E 00
43	0.99903E 00
44	0.99958E 00
45	0.99984E 00
46	0.99995E 00
47	0.99998E 00
48	0.99999E 00
49	0.10000E 01

10

Table 2 (Continued)

Number of Targets = 8; Number of Transcripts = 8

SUM OF RANKS	P-VALUE
8	0.59605E-07
9	0.53644E-06
10	0.26822E-05
11	0.98348E-05
12	0.29504E-04
13	0.76711E-04
14	0.17899E-03
15	0.38356E-03
16	0.76663E-03
17	0.14447E-02
18	0.25867E-02
19	0.44264E-02
20	0.72724E-02
21	0.11515E-01
22	0.17628E-01
23	0.26157E-01
24	0.37702E-01
25	0.52890E-01
26	0.72328E-01
27	0.96562E-01
28	0.12602E 00
29	0.16095E 00
30	0.20139E 00
31	0.24714E 00
32	0.29772E 00
33	0.35237E 00
34	0.41012E 00
35	0.46982E 00
36	0.53018E 00
37	0.58988E 00
38	0.64763E 00
39	0.70228E 00
40	0.75286E 00
41	0.79860E 00
42	0.83905E 00
43	0.87398E 00
44	0.90344E 00
45	0.92767E 00
46	0.94711E 00
47	0.96229E 00
48	0.97384E 00
49	0.98237E 00
50	0.98849E 00
51	0.99273E 00
52	0.99557E 00
53	0.99741E 00

11

Table 2 (Continued)

Number of Targets = 9; Number of Transcripts = 9

SUM OF RANKS	P-VALUE
9	0.25812E-08
10	0.25812E-07
11	0.14196E-06
12	0.56786E-06
13	0.18455E-05
14	0.51675E-05
15	0.12919E-04
16	0.29529E-04
17	0.62748E-04
18	0.12547E-03
19	0.23821E-03
20	0.43226E-03
21	0.75357E-03
22	0.12673E-02
23	0.20628E-02
24	0.32586E-02
25	0.50075E-02
26	0.75003E-02
27	0.10968E-01
28	0.15683E-01
29	0.21954E-01
30	0.30122E-01
31	0.40548E-01
32	0.53601E-01
33	0.69639E-01
34	0.88989E-01
35	0.11192E 00
36	0.13864E 00
37	0.16924E 00
38	0.20370E 00
39	0.24189E 00
40	0.28353E 00
41	0.32821E 00
42	0.37540E 00
43	0.42447E 00
44	0.47469E 00
45	0.52531E 00
46	0.57553E 00
47	0.62460E 00
48	0.67179E 00
49	0.71647E 00
50	0.75811E 00
51	0.79630E 00
52	0.83076E 00
53	0.86136E 00
54	0.88807E 00

12

Table 2 (Concluded)

Number of Targets = 10; Number of Transcripts = 10

SUM OF RANKS	P-VALUE
10	0.10000E-09
11	0.11000E-08
12	0.66000E-08
13	0.28600E-07
14	0.10010E-06
15	0.30030E-06
16	0.80080E-06
17	0.19448E-05
18	0.43758E-05
19	0.92378E-05
20	0.18475E-04
21	0.35261E-04
22	0.64559E-04
23	0.11412E-03
24	0.19512E-03
25	0.32387E-03
26	0.52317E-03
27	0.82418E-03
28	0.12686E-02
29	0.19106E-02
30	0.28197E-02
31	0.40825E-02
32	0.58049E-02
33	0.81133E-02
34	0.11156E-01
35	0.15103E-01
36	0.20143E-01
37	0.26484E-01
38	0.34347E-01
39	0.43960E-01
40	0.55552E-01
41	0.69345E-01
42	0.85541E-01
43	0.10432E 00
44	0.12581E 00
45	0.15011E 00
46	0.17725E 00
47	0.20721E 00
48	0.23987E 00
49	0.27506E 00
50	0.31255E 00
51	0.35202E 00
52	0.39311E 00
53	0.43538E 00
54	0.47838E 00

13

probability of obtaining such a rank ordering result by chance of 0.0403..., which is significant. A more complete set of tables is given in Solfvin et al.[2]

REFERENCES

1. H.E. Puthoff and R. Targ, "A Perceptual Channel for Information Transfer over Kilometer Distances: Historical Perspective and Recent Research," Proc. IEEE, Vol. 64, pp. 329-354 (March 1976).

2. G. Solfvin et al., "Some New Methods of Analysis for Preferential-Ranking Data," J. Am. Soc. for Psychical Research, Vol. 72, No. 2 (April 1978).