

[Paul H. Smith](#)

On the issue of Psychics vs. Remote Viewers: The issue here with psychics is the same as with remote viewers: there is no standard, and their abilities vary with each individual who calls him or herself "psychic." Trying to judge the whole field by citing anecdotal stories is as useless as doing that for remote viewers. Here are some of the things that I believe about this: That some psychics are lame, but many are not. That there are many who call themselves "remote viewers" (even some who have been formally trained), but can't remote view their way out of a paper bag...and others who definitely can! That it is waaaaayyy to soon to give up on the the term "remote viewing," because CRV alone can't possibly fill that gap. (Ask Joe McMoneagle if he's a CRVer. He will emphatically tell you he's not. And I have yet to see a CRVer who consistently meets the quality of work that Joe demonstrates with his own unique flavor of remote viewing -- which is definitely NOT CRV.) Are remote viewers "better" than psychics? Are psychics "better" than remote viewers? That pretty much depends on who the psychic is and who the remote viewer is. [Pam Coronado](#) did a pilot study awhile back using a gaggle of psychic and remote viewing volunteers. You got the differences in quality you would expect in any grouping of volunteers of this nature. She was unable to say that one side was "better" than the other, but she was able to point out some useful distinctions about how each group approach the problem differently, with different sets of strengths and weaknesses. If further research shows that holds, then arguing which is "better" would be like arguing whether a crescent wrench or a channel-locks was "better." The answer there is -- it depends on what you need done.

[Jon Knowles](#) Thank you, Paul Smith, for starting the new thread. I would like to know the names of some of the psychics who learned CRV that Lyn Buchanan alludes to in the earlier thread. Pam Coronado is one. Who are the others? If in the position of hiring for an RV work/project, it would be good to know who these highly accomplished people are.

[Paul H. Smith](#) There are a few more comments to add here. First, if you think the RV training community is chaotic, take a look at what passes for training in the psychic community, LOL. At least CRV started from a consistent, well-ordered approach that served as a point of departure for all kinds of additions, subtractions, and many embellishments, some of which may have added value, but most of which didn't. The psychic training community (at least the ones who believe it can be trained, vs. those who think it is a "gift" pure and simple) really has no central core of doctrine from which to begin so it is, if anything, more eclectic and fragmented than the RV community is -- though perhaps not as confrontational (well, in public anyway, LOL -- I've run into a number of mean-spirited and arrogant psychics; fortunately, there are many that are generous and humble as well). This unevenness of approach I think contributes to the perception that somehow psychics are less rigorous and lower quality performers than RVers. But again, that really depends on the quality of training and the quality of psychic more than whether the discipline is better (and the same could be said for RV as well). Ingo made the point to me on several occasions that his goal with CRV structure was to instill in naive subjects lessons-learned both from the best of psychic functioning and the most useful insights science could provide to bring RVers up to the level of high psychic functioning without having to suffer through the interminable trial-and-error process that most "natural" psychics and early RVers had to. Not that they would have NO trial and error work (practice, practice, practice), but that they would be able to learn principles and proper behaviors sooner and reach a higher level of functioning more quickly. From what I have seen of those who have received proper training and applied themselves in a committed way, I think Ingo was generally right.

[Paul H. Smith](#) Which is, by the way, why I teach Ingo-style CRV and not some other self-branded psychic methodology! (Hmmm. let me see...what would that be? PHSRV? Nope, ain't gonna happen, LOL.)

[Angela Thompson Smith](#) Just a reminder...The earliest written reference to remote viewing can be found in an IEEE paper written in 1976 by Hal Puthoff and Russell Targ and entitled A Perceptual Channel for Information Transfer over Kilometer Distances. They wrote: "As observed in the laboratory, the basic phenomenon appears to cover a range of subjective experiences variously referred to in the literature as autospicy (in the medical literature); exteriorization or dissociation (psychological literature); simple clairvoyance; traveling clairvoyance or out-of-body experience (parapsychology literature); or astral projection (occult literature). We choose the term 'remote viewing' as a neutral descriptive term, free from prior associations and bias as to mechanism."

[Pam Coronado](#) I must have missed Lyn's post but will find it. What I aspire to in my teaching and my own operational work, is to bring the best of both skills together (as Joe obviously does). If CRV didn't have benefits, I wouldn't waste my time with it. What I have found about untrained psychics is that they don't realize they can be wrong or why they are wrong. That lack of humility is a BIG problem because they profess to be 100% accurate and make other damaging statements. [Paul H. Smith](#) is correct too in that there is no standard for teaching "psychic development" so it is even more fractured and chaotic than the remote viewing world. LOL I was fortunately to find someone like Bevy Jaegers to take me under her wing and introduce me to remote viewing. I agree that much time and trial by error can be minimized with good training.

[Pat McDonald](#) "Intuitive development" seems an apt term to describe what CRV and other training/mentoring systems seek to achieve. It also strikes me that individuals will find different mentors and methods repulsive or attractive. Certainly some will be more popular than others, but I guess what the need expressed in this thread is for some kind of "gold" standard - some robust method of evaluating an individual that gives some idea of how "intuitively developed" they are. Closer one I know currently is PSI, Lyn Buchanan's viewer profiling. I think that kind of work should expand tremendously. Or at the very least published volumes of individual session efforts. A slow process in my personal case. Perhaps I'd be better off as an blind analyst,,, kind of an arbiter between tasker and viewer. meh.

[Pam Coronado](#) When I was hired by Discovery Channel for Sensing Murder, I had to audition and hit certain marks. They started with hundreds and ended up with a handful willing to test. We worked on three solved cases so our answers could be judged for accuracy. To become operational I would expect a viewer/intuitive to be consistent across several cases, not brilliant on just one. I now set that standard for my own missing person foundation. It can be done. I know my students well enough to know which tool I want to use for which job. It's not a matter of who is better it's a matter of who is best equipped for which particular task. [Lyn Buchanan](#) had that figured out long ago, I believe.

[Daz Smith](#) Pam, every viewer / intuitive does bring 'themselves' to the table and we all have different skills that only practice shows. I would like to hear more on your foundation as im looking for project of this ilk and have experience of well over 200 missing persons cases now.

[Daz Smith](#) Psychics Vs remote viewers - well im not sure IF any is better than the other because so much else is in play: talent, the target/situation, the day/time, the situation and soooo much more. but what i can say and from years of experience and in providing Rv services to paying clients as a project manager and being paid to be a remote viewer is that I would value a paid for service MORE from a RV source , because when done correctly and in protocol, I can be sure the data is a mix of100% intuitive/noise against natural psychics and a loose approach and maybe-face-to-face, which is fraught with other possible data streams for the information.

I just dont understand why all natural psychics dont want to take the protocol approach to be better for themselves and for their clients.

All I know from personal opinion is that clairvoyance, mediumship, divination and all that stuff was great - it worked for me and very well. I spent years learning this stuff - but it was chaotic. When I found CRV/RV it was like bang - you can now drive this thing - you are in charge, you choose the direction and where the flow of incoming data goes. I became converted Now, is my psi data now more accurate - possibly not, is it more organized, less chaotic, less symbolic and more tangible/discernible - absolutely!

[Colin Ross](#) Sorry in advance for bringing this up as its may be a 'getting old' subject for some of you I'm curious has any of you did a session on missing Madeleine McCann & what you got out of it? Message me directly if you don't want it public  
Thanking you  
Cheers  
Colin

[Simon Turnbull](#) I am here purely because I believe RV in whatever form is extremely valuable, and should be a discipline taken up by all professional (or semi-pro) psychics ... I have promoted this point of view to every pro member of the Australian Psychics Association (and there are hundreds) with some measure of success ... What I'm looking for here is some support in getting them to commit themselves to taking up some training ... I have seen the results of training psychics in the FOX Tv show 'The One' we did here in Australia which was top rating, and we were able to get the producers to advise the audience (I nearly said 'viewers') that remote viewing was a tool of choice used in some of the more successful challenges ... The psychics who trained for both seasons appreciated what could be done with RV, so we were able to get their attention ... the obvious point I'm making here is that further encouragement of psychics to take up RV is what is needed, not making them question if they are 'worthy' ...

[Lorraine Connon](#) There are threads @TKR [Colin Ross](#). I remember posting there about my contribution to Lynne McTaggart's collected psinfo, and also reading non-RV alternative versions of events from abroad I hadn't seen before (here in UK) <http://www.dojopsi.info/forum/index.php>

[Daz Smith](#) Simon, all they have to do to adapt to use their skill under the banner of 'remote viewing' is to work within the rv protocols - a few simple rules. Now, if you mean more and are also talking about using a remote viewing methodology itself then that's a different thing.

but you dont have to use a methodology like CRV to be a remote viewer - just the protocols.

[Slorri Johansson](#) [Colin Ross](#), there is at least one group session done over at the DoJo. Not professionals, but there might be things to sift through.

[Simon Turnbull](#) I understand that to be true, Daz Smith (whenever I try to get the Smith part to link, Angela and Paul always come up first) ... and I guess that is the point, that so long as they do as you say they should be fine ...

[Sandy Frost](#) Daz and Simon, Please keep up your dialogue! You might be brainstorming a new way of developing a tool or set of steps or protocol or applications for psychics or intuitives or whatever paranormal discipline or gift someone might want to explore. It doesn't even need to be called remote viewing. I am a natural, an intuitive journalist, and have found that if I pay attention to synchronicity, the "news gods" bless me. It's wonderful when like-minds can start to resonate create and brain storm.

[Tunde Atunrase](#) Recent "debates" about RV and its origins is not going to ensure natural psychics move towards embracing the RV protocol. Its going to be even harder until remote viewers themselves know how to differentiate between a remote viewing method and the remote viewing protocol. We have a long way to go yet. Alternatively we could come up with a new protocol name that both Natural Psychics and Remote Viewers can follow and become the new standard. In fact I think its inevitably going to happen at some point.

[Paul H. Smith](#) This may sound a little cynical, but establishing a protocol based on its ability to lead to a "kumbiyah" moment isn't probably the best basis on which to ground a success. The only criterion ought to be what actually leads to better and more consistent quality, let the chips fall where they may. That's why the original RV protocol was so successful. It left behind the then-traditional approach to parapsychology research, and broke new ground which led to a great deal of success. That's why the parapsychology community (and even beyond) was so excited by it at the time. But it seems to me that parapsychology is mostly moribund these days -- the presentiment paradigm was very successful (and replications keep being done to a small degree); the DMILS paradigm was successful; the Ganzfeld was successful. But all of these are either done or tapering off at present. Remote viewing in the laboratory is in the same boat. It's only in the popular arena that it is still being pursued with any vigor, and even the energy of that is being dissipated because practitioners are all headed off barking after all kinds of different XRV squirrels. Daz's insistence on the importance of the remote viewing PROTOCOL -- no matter what the RV method -- is crucial, but honored as much in breach as in practice, it often seems.

[Sandy Frost](#) Tunde, it's happening as we speak. Or write. Keep your thinking caps on, you guys. Develop something beyond the military dogma. Those days and applications are gone. We can honor the old guard but the old guard needs to know when to step aside and let visionaries, naturals and outliers mingle for more creative discoveries and more humanitarian applications. Refuse to believe the world is flat and go beyond the boundaries. Push them. Listen to your intuition and know that questioning everything is the right thing to do.

[Tunde Atunrase](#) @Colin Ross - regarding Madeleine the Aurora Group did a RV project on this case - the full results have never been released to the public but you can read about some of what they came up with here. The sessions were all done double blind.

<http://www.dojopsi.info/forum/index.php?topic=2899.0>

For some reason none of the top psychics or RVers want to touch this case or say too much in the open. If ever there was a case for RV to prove its critics wrong that it can't be used to find missing persons this is it.

[Tamra Temple](#) Paul, I'm not sure if you misunderstood this sentence or are reacting to past experiences not contained in this thread, so I'll copy and paste "And at the same time, the trainers who have invested time and money deserve to be paid and make a living in their chosen profession."

[Jon Knowles](#) For those new to the field: there are now several DVD/video oriented RV courses available. Angela Thompson Smith is offering a form of distant learning in addition to in-person courses. Courtney Brown has an extensive set of free videos (24), Farsight Voyager Remote Viewing (his method is an offshoot of CRV). Stephan Schwartz offers "the Gold Course" on a set of DVDs. Teresa Frisch offers free online videos from a variety of instructors, which could supplement other training. For ARV, Marty Rosenblatt has posted videos which show in detail the work of the Applied Precognition Project.

I feel that I benefited greatly from a 3-day in-person course followed by distant training (emails, pdfs and phone calls) within a team of viewers and instructors, with further followup weekends of team training in Carlsbad (by TDS - no longer in operation). I am not aware that a similar opportunity exists today, in the U.S. anyway, but there are plenty of individual trainers. A good in-person trainer can provide an experience that may make the difference for the majority of us who are not "natural psychics", and perhaps for natural psychics as well.

[Andrew Usher](#) I did basic CRV with [Paul H. Smith](#), in Glasgow, and it was intense, in a good way , i felt it was great value for money, no complaints, training was long, and a lot of work. Paul works you hard, but an amazing experience. I took lots away from it, not just from a remote viewing aspect, but much of what we discussed i then applied to other aspects of my life and business, and it was really successful. And, i liked the idea of training as close to the source as i could, i do that with all my training, be it martial arts, visual effects. My big belief is that if you have the resources, then train as close to the source as you can.

[Tunde Atunrase](#) True Jon lots of assorted XRV materials out there, various "workshops" etc....etc...but where are the standard CRV DVDs? Isn't it time someone produced a set by now? That way folk who can't travel so far or pay \$6000 can at least get some form of professional DVD training as taught by the military and Ingo and not a watered down version by someone certified by someone who trained with someone who knew someone that probably knew Ingo...cause that's where CRV is heading in 20 years time

[Nathan Peters](#) Tunde, I'm not sure how different "standard CRV" would be from what most people are training in the field. I know a LearnRV student who took some training from [Paul H. Smith](#) and it seemed to be fine: Paul didn't have to "retrain", they were already on the same page.What makes, in your estimation, a non-standard CRV?

[Nathan Peters](#) My background is LearnRV and the S stages I learned seemed pretty much the same as are detailed in Paul's military CRV manual.

[Andrew Usher](#) Learn RV and what [Paul H. Smith](#) are two completely different things, i know, i have done the training with Paul, and saw the LearnRV dvd's, you cant compare them in any way shape or form in my opinion.

[Tamra Temple](#) Tunde has a point there. If the first generation trainers are going to pass on their training, the DVDs will have to be recorded before too long. Well, within the next 30 yrs, give or take a decade. I don't know when they want to retire, but hope making recorded training is on their to-do before retirement lists

[Andrew Usher](#) It will become like NLP, (training to be a trainer, who trains a trainer to be a trainer) +1 - 1/ bastardisation = ocne useful, now diluted beyond intention.

[Tunde Atunrase](#) Hi Nathan, I'm fairly certain LearnRV and CRV are quite different in structure. I learned the TDS method plus a six-month online extensive training before TDS closed. We were also taught Remote Influencing and Remote Healing. When I came across the 1985 Tom Mcnear Declassified CRV Manual I was surprised by the content of some of the stages missing and which I felt could have helped my viewing a bit more. So I always recommended at least folk learn the basic CRV model if they are going down the structured route. Having said that some of the advanced stages of TDS and maybe TRV such as mind probes, RH and RI are superior to CRV although I have heard rumors Ingo also had advanced stages for CRV as well but I have yet to see any evidence to back up such claims....not yet anyway.

[Simon Turnbull](#) I charge AUD \$2000 for a weekend, plus airfare and hotel if I have to go to them ... But I only do one on one, as I feel I can give much more dedicated attention to the individual, as its pretty intense ... However, teaching is not my primary source of income, so I generally wait to be asked to do it ... The cost is not the issue, I feel ... People will pay what they can afford ... There is room for low cost courses (of course), but perhaps they can be viewed as intros or 'appetisers' ... Similar to many other mainstream course available ... No, the main issue is marketing; letting people know RV is out there to the mainstream; simplifying that process so the general public can understand the opportunity (as every quality story that comes out in mainstream media should be treated like 'gold') ... In short, this process will be much more effective if there is a joint position taken by everybody, without the over stressing of protocol ... Of course protocol is important, it's an intrinsic part of the process, and it should be revealed to the public as a natural process of evolution in the learning process, not held like a hammer over their heads ... That's too much of a 'heavy metal' approach ... There has to be trust that protocol will not be left out ...

[Simon Turnbull](#) Re-reading the above, there's a lot of 'process' involved ... I guess there needs to be and the learning process needs to be easily understood by the punters, to use a rock 'n' roll term ...

[Paul H. Smith](#) Tamra, I wasn't reacting so much to posts on here as kind of the sum total of comments involving paid instruction. Part of that is due to [Stephan A. Schwartz](#) who often makes jibes of that nature. But it is often the case that we get criticized for charging to help people develop what is thought of as a "God-given" (or Krishna, or the Tao, or whatever your deity of choice might be, LOL) ability. I'm not saying anyone on this thread was saying that (I think my use of "this" in my earlier post was ill-advised because it makes it sounds like I was pointing the finger). It had just been fuming around inside my head for a few days and the tilt of the conversation at that point served as an attachment point for my splutterings.

[Tamra Temple](#) Paul, that's what I thought really. And since it has come up, I have to say that the time you put into your training classes and the fact that you keep them small for the one on one quality translates to a very low per hour charge indeed. High quality, low cost. If hotels were free it would be an even better deal, so what do you do? You work out a deal with an awesome hotel and do all your classes there so the rates are extremely reasonable for a wonderful vacation packed full of excellent instruction with all the amenities. Don't let anyone get you questioning the value of your week long classes. Like Andrew said, nothing compares in the internet, videotaped or webinar (impersonal, non-face to face) set of instruction... although [Marty Rosenblatt's](#) webinars are a very close second.

[Daz Smith](#) LOL this almost needs to be split into separate topics again - bu trying to push my question back into play - if the rv projects arnt 'up-to-scratch' then whats the reasons and could IRVA and the teachers, do more/rectify why so much viewing is being done badly?

Should IRVA allow improper or out of protocol rv projects to be presents as valid Rv at its conferences and do the teachers do enough to convey good remote viewing practices to students - because we can all see that something is going wrong somewhere.

[Simon Turnbull](#) You know, Angela, Paul, and Daz, my American grandfather also was a Smith ... Howard Smith, from around Massachusetts around the end of the 1800's ... a banker , who also ran an office in Delhi, India in the 20's ... have to dig up more about him for the family tree at some stage ... Hmmm, maybe I'll use remote viewing ... Believe it or not, there were a lot less Smiths back in the day ...

[Simon Turnbull](#) You know, I should walk the walk and renew my IRVA membership ... I've been feeling guilty for awhile now ...

[Paul H. Smith](#) Simon, My dad says that everyone was named 'Smith' until they did something wrong. Don't know for sure if that's true, but it has a nice ring to it!

[Lyn Buchanan](#) At 2/8/2013 ( Friday ), Paul wrote:

>I wasn't reacting so much to posts on here as kind of the sum total of comments involving paid instruction. Part of that is due to Stephan A. Schwartz who often makes jibes of that nature. But it is often the case that we get criticized for charging to help people develop what is thought of as a "God-given" (or Krishna, or the Tao, or whatever your deity of choice might be, LOL)

When I decided to quit a very good-paying job with one of the Beltway computer companies in order to devote my life to CRV and its benefits to mankind (sounds lofty and cheesy, but it was true, and still is), I didn't sit down and figure how much money I could make from it. I got together with Linda and together, we figured how much money I would need to go on supporting my family. We had to cut corners, but it was worth it to both of us. Ever since then, people like Stephan, Russ, and a lot of others have jibed and criticized that all we arein CRV for is to get money from people. It's quite insulting and shows to me that there are many, many people from every level of our society, and even every level of our own field who 1) don't do their homework, 2) judge with pre-conceived prejudices, 3) will say anything derogatory about anyone they see as "competition" to their own desires to be top dog in the field, and I could probably go on with items through 9) or 10). It's sad, really. Every month at bill-paying time, there is a twinge of wonder about where we would be if I hadn't made that decision. Every time I spend 2 or 3 full days doing nothing but answering endless and often dumb or derogatory emails (like this one), I remember that I used to be able to walk out the door of work and drive home in the evening and get weekends off, etc. When I used CRV for my own research projects, my own benefits, and my own pleasure, I was much better off than now. But I know that I wouldn't go back. There's that terrible, terrible problem stopping me..... I care.

I don't charge for training to get rich (wouldn't happen even if I did). I charge for training in order to pay bills, have food to eat, and to keep us going. If anyone objects to that and thinks that I should do everything for free, then I would challenge them to call the company they work for and offer to come in every day, work long hours, and do it for free. If I did this for free, I would have to stop doing it altogether in order to go make a living (probably a better one) somewhere else. As far as I'm concerned, when people accuse me of just wanting to get rich off other people, it only shows to me that the problem lies with them, their egos, their being too lazy to find out the facts, their prejudicial mind sets, their ignorance of what is really going on, and their unwillingness to find out.

I once had a guy call me on the phone and chew me out for charging anything at all because, he said, it was his tax money that paid for my training, so I now owed him free training. I asked him what he did for a living. He was a mechanic. I asked him where he got his training, and he said it was in the Army. But, somehow, he wasn't willing to stop charging for fixing cars because everyone else's tax money paid for his training. He certainly wouldn't come and fix mine for free.

[Simon Turnbull](#) Hi Stephan, my daughter must live real close to you, in McLean ...

[Simon Turnbull](#) I don't know why Stephan's photo is there, but my 'Like' was for you, Lyn, and what you were saying ...

[Tamra Temple](#) because his name/facebook link is in the post

[Jon Knowles](#) I am also archiving this thread for easier finding and reading.

[Tko Seven](#) because of this post I decided to formalize my 1-10 system, for grading my sessions, from 0 which means that it was a total dud; to 10 which means that I correctly identified the target in written words and with a detailed drawing that matches the target photo.....and on the topic of paying or not for classes, I don't mind paying at all, it's just that I'm broke right now hahahahahaha and I'm only still starting at this(oct 2011 was when I got my 1st taste of RV). I spent 2520\$ on training/classes last year. if we do crack the lottery or get some big inheritance, I will be taking classes with JM, PS, and LB for sure, and I'll probably hit up the Flynn Hawaiians for at least an internet course. In the meantime, my daily one hour practice is fun, and I download anything and everything I can get my hands on and go through it, when it is connected to the "originals". By the way, my personal living expenses here in 3rd world, or probably 2nd world Mexico are \$5 CAN a day, that's for everything. I love being in class, and just as much, I love being around the OG RV'ers and as well, I prepared a 5 hour workshop and gave it once for free, that took me 20 hours to prepare, and successfully got the class through 4 sessions with major target hits on the 4th, and included audio video, double blind targets etc etc