**Facebook thread started February 4, 2013 following the passing of Ingo Swann:**

Note: If you see a format like: "Simon Turnbull Sandy Frost I do not...", this means that Simon Turnbull wrote the post and he was addressing Sandy Frost. Facebook filled in the second name in full when Simon typed "Sandy".

********************

Alfred Cota: Lets set the record straight... There are some Fans out there that credit Ingo Douglas Swann as being The Father of Remote Viewing, this is not true. The fact of the matter is that Ingo Researched and Developed a Remote Viewing Protocol of Coordinating Remote Viewing or known as CRV in the 1970's and that Dr. Rufus Osgood Mason is the Father of Present Day Remote Viewing. Dr. Mason's research was published sometime around 1897 and is a historic fact, bar none. Ingo Swann's contribution is well noted and is highly respected by not only me, but also by ASPR Director of Research, Dr. Karis Osis, who tested both Ingo and I. Dr. Osis spoke highly of Ingo to me and I took his word for it. My involvement with the Phase Two ASPR Beacon Experiments, helping to varifying Ingo's data is a fact. By not recognizing this, in my opinion it, any so called heresay discredits Ingo and those that were there being supportive when Ingo's data was being challanged by the ASPR Board. It was to my opinion that Ingo's data was varified and stood well by our supportive imput at the ASPR at that time. What Ingo did when he later worked under Dr. Hal Puthoff and Dr. Russell Targ speaks for itself, and should not be discounted nor dismissed ether. Please note: Anyone challanging me on these facts disqualify themselves as so-called experts. I say this in support of the true history of what we call present day Remote Viewing. Though we lost a pioneer and contributor, we should not forget what he left us and that it was always a team effort from the beginning. Brave Blessings: Al (aka: A. Edward Moch, Psychical Analyst-Consultant, Pioneer Remote Viewer

Simon Turnbull If you want to be picky about it it was first researched by King Croesus of Lydia (according to Herodotus and Russell Targ ) ... But it may not have been called Remote Viewing at the time ...

Alfred Cota Hello Simon... If you read my statement, I said "Present Day Remote Viewing". Early forms of what we call Remote Viewing did pre-existed for thousands of years. No problem here.

Simon Turnbull Of course, Alfred, and what was it like to work with Dr. Osis? ...

Stephan A. Schwartz In fact Remote Viewing dates back to at least the 5th century BCE, but I have little doubt that its use dates back much further. The first recorded outbound experiment is to be found in the 46th chapter of Herodotus, as I wrote when I wrote my first paper on this subject in 1968. In those days, I called Distant Viewing.

The first use of nonlocal perception to solve a crime involved a peasant farmer, Jacques Aymar, who solved a murder with nonlocal perception, a kind of mixed dowsing/RV protocol. He was also the subject of the first government commission to study RV, and this was the first use of an explicitly blind protocol employed including the rudiments of controls. The Abbé de Vallemont, Pierre le Lorrain, wrote a treatise, Occult Physics, or Treatise on the Divining Rod, which discussed nonlocal perception. It was published in Paris in 1693. The Theosophists used another protocol to view subatomic particles. This work was published as Occult Chemistry. It describes Neutrinos 12 years before Rutherford "discovered" them, as well as what today would be called Charms and Quarks. Edgar Cayce was routinely providing nonlocal perception data, including explicit RV from the late 19th century until his death. Stefan Ossowiecki was doing RV work with Pluznikov and Ritchie from the 1920s until his death at the hands of the Nazis in 1944. I wrote a book Secret Vaults of Time, describing the use of Remote Viewing in archaeology, covering research from the late 19th century up until the time my own research began in 1966.

The presumption that there is something special, or superior about CRV, which is a common belief is simply without basis. I have no doubt that many people have had excellent remote viewings using CRV. But, as the above shows, many people have also produced excellent viewings using all manner of protocols. Any technique that encourages one's capacity to sustain intentioned focus will work.

I recognize there is a paper in the Stargate files, "Track I Training R&D" written by Hal Puthoff and Martha Thomson in 1984, that makes certain claims, and this seems to be the basis for the CRV is special claim. However, there are many things in the Stargate files, of varying accuracy and quality. Back before the Christmas holidays Daz Smith used this paper to make this assertion once again, and later that week I heard it again. I get asked regularly in my position as the spokesperson of the Parapsychological Association about this.

Daz' claim prompted me to settle this issue once and for all. Because I was not part of SRI, although I knew and worked with most of the SRI people, I did not have first hand knowledge from which to respond. So I wrote Hal and Ed May. Russell had left the program in 1982.

Hal chose not to make any comment in defense of the paper. Ed responded by sending me an extract from his forthcoming book on the program, giving me permission to quote it: "The concept behind Ingo's remote viewing training idea was based upon one very sound scientific principle and, in addition, an often-heard anecdotal concept. Many people are aware of B.F. Skinner and his behavioral ideas in psychology. As an example a pigeon can be trained to press a lever to get food by rewarding it with food pellets every time it may have randomly bumped into a lever. Over time, the bird recognizes what it is necessary to do to get the food. An extension of this basic idea is called Operant conditioning…. One necessary aspect of operant conditioning in biofeedback, for example, is that the reward follows rapidly after the desired behavior. Ingo latched on to this idea first by breaking the well-known and sacrosanct requirement when doing experiments that they must be conducted under double-blind conditions. In the context of an ESP trial, no one who knows anything about the ESP target may have any interaction whatsoever with the psychic. This idea is true for all laboratory studies and for the beginning of all operational uses of ESP – though depending upon the circumstances, it may be useful to begin to break this rule in operations but for very proscribed reasons. Ingo, of course, knew this as well as did the SRI project management.

"However, they made the decision to violate the double-blind requirements with a variation of the tired and false argument that 'the ends justify the means.' So in the vast majority of training sessions where Ingo took on the role of trainer, he was looking at the target photograph and the trainee was sitting across a table from him. Professor (Emeritus) Robert Rosenthal, the renowned psychologist from Harvard University, and others have amply demonstrated the power of nonverbal communication. In fact, if someone who effectively expresses ideas nonverbally is paired with someone who is equally good at understanding others who communicate that way, then that form of communication may surpass normal verbal communications. It can certainly seem psychic.

"Going the way Ingo proceeded makes it a major disaster."

May, then, added: "There were serious problems with regard to Ingo's RV training not the least of which it was soundly rejected by all the main-line people at that time. In addition, without almost any exceptions, his "trained" Army people produced no intelligence for the Ft. Meade Unit. Almost all of it was obtained by non-Ingo-trained people." By which I think he means people like Joe McMoneagle.

So in conclusion: if CRV works for you, go for it, as long as you do it using a double-blind protocol. If you are not double blind you are wasting your time. But don't think that it is superior to other ways of accessing nonlocal perception data.

Loraine Connon ... yet.

Daz Smith here we go already - let the bashing begin...

Simon Turnbull I love a good stoush ... it brings out many versions of the truth ... sound familiar? ...

Loraine Connon I won't be concerning myself with any bashing. Ingo's departure means we'll never get the political factoids from the horse's mouth.

I always wished he'd enter public RV debates to settle some of the disputes, though now I see he was saving his energy to do good instead - he's become a dazzling beacon in the eternal moment for us all.

Pat McDonald Well Lorraine, Ingo did give as much of his story as he wanted to at his website. He states there that he didn't want to give all his recollections of his research time (1971-1986?) as that could hurt people who he still regarded as his friends. His choice, not to cause upset. It's a very long read, and it's just the Ingo Swann take on things, but the words are still there;- http://www.biomindsuperpowers.com/

Daz Smith Well it didn't take long for the knives to come out and for the re-imagining of Rv history to take place did it?

Stephan A. Schwartz - you said:

"Daz' claim prompted me to settle this issue once and for all..."

Stephan this settled 'nothing' - this debate is not about a single document - i have presented a handful and there are more. there are over 5 years worth of documentation from SRI and the military, from oversight committees and more - all indicate that CRV worked, and increased the yield/accuracy of its participants. The military and its oversight committees all report they were happy with the results - do you really think they would report this IF the training was not working? and its not me saying this - this is recorded in official documentation.

Instead of asking others and getting biased quoted from them may i suggest you actually read the available material - its all available in many sources.

Also this quote from May:

"There were serious problems with regard to Ingo's RV training not the least of which it was soundly rejected by all the main-line people at that time. In addition, without almost any exceptions, his "trained" Army people produced no intelligence for the Ft. Meade Unit. Almost all of it was obtained by non-Ingo-trained people."

No it wasn't - SRI was behind the CRV methodology from the mid 70s to the mid 80s - how can this be classed as 'rejected by all the main line people'. Again does not ring true when comparing to the RV data available in the Star Gate archive. I have seen documents detailing accurate intel viewing from CRV trained staff.

Again the army paid for CRV - they then continued to use CRV for another decade or so after they paid for it - are you seriously saying they would have done this, under numerous oversight committees eyes - when it didn't work - nor never produced a single piece of intel data?

Daz Smith I suppose this document from the many i now have also doesn't matter??? - the fact that this science oversight committee states about CRV and Ingos training:

"A considerable variety of material was presented with photographic backup in support of the validity of the perceptual method. Much of this was highly impressive. The data showed the effects of training on the success rate, which typically reached a sustained plateau at a level higher than prior to training, both for groups of subjects as well as for individual trainees."

http://www.remoteviewed.com/science%20oversight%20report1984.pdf

yet its still claimed, and with no supporting paper evidence that CRV & training didn't work - yet time after time documents like this show it did and even from credible scientists outside of the program reviewing it.

As I said its not about a single document its about ALL documents spanning at least form 1979 -1986 that support CRV and its training.

Daz Smith Also stephan:

And no intel value from CRV trainees right - then why does this document a report form early in CRV training (1980) the very first test of CRV in ops mode say:

"CRV Applications
In this program SRI is charged with investigating U.S. capabilities in applied RV in order to provide data useful in assessing the threat potential of corresponding Soviet applications. Specifically, SRI has been tasked * with examining a series of geographic coordinates using RV techniques with the goals of:

(l) Establishing the authenticity and reliability of the RV phenomenon.
(2) Developing and refining experimental techniques and understanding of the RV phenomenon.
(3) Establishing the best potential kinds of targets and best potential use of the RV phenomenon.

In response to these requirements SRI has pursued application tasks of interest to the client community. These tasks (Class A protocols) have been pursued during the time frame in which the reliability- improvement program of the previous section has been in effect. Therefore, the quality of response to these tasks provides an indirect measure of the efficiency of the reliability-improvement procedures.

The CRV tasks described below were carried out in response to quick reaction requirements set by a representative of the intelligence community (hereafter referred to as IC representative) involved in monitoring the progress of the work. During these scans all SRI personnel were kept blind to the target. The tasks and associated response data are outlined here in summary form.

SNIP....

"A total of five remote viewing sessions, involving three remote viewers, was carried out on a Caribbean site designated by an IC representative to be a site of interest. Targeting was on the basis of coordinates supplied to SRI by an IC representative.

The analysis of this site has been completed. Each of the three viewers individually supplied pertinent, relevant data with regard to the target site, and their data taken together resulted in a target/transcript correspondence rating of 7 (given by user) on a 0-7 point evaluation scale shown in Table 3.

The results generated in these operational tasks to date, all obtained with remote viewers incorporating the procedures developed in the reliability-improvement program, appear to provide our first (and
encouraging) evidence with regard to a possible upgraded level of performance.Further data needs to be generated, however, before a definitive assessment can be provided, and this requirement will be pursued during the remainder of the program."

So, in the first operational CRV test they provided intel of value to an intel customer - yet Ed May claims no intel what-so-ever came from CRV students - you see what I mean Stephan - the claims being made do not match the documentation - and this is the first document I laid my hands on there are many more.

http://www.remoteviewed.com/jan1980%20qtr%20report.pdf

Alfred Cota Hello Simon... For the time I personally met and talked to him, I found Dr. Osis to have been a very nice person. In the brief discussions we had about Ingo, he spoke very highly of him.

Paul H. Smith Stephan -- I am hampered at the moment with too much to do and too little time to do it in. However, reading the excerpt from Ed May's book that you have posted, I have to say that Ed clearly does not understand the principles nor process of CRV sufficiently to be pronouncing authoritatively on it. He misses the point in many ways. That often happens when people try to expound on something they both disdain and have not sufficiently educated themselves about. Being at SRI at the time may be necessary, but not sufficient to be correct or conversant with everything that went on there. I respect Ed May for any number of things, but I think his comments over the years about remote viewing training in general and CRV in specific reflect a fundamental misunderstanding of what both entail.

Paul H. Smith BTW, your comment that "Hal chose not to make any comment in defense of the paper" is cleverly worded, but barely accurate. I've been communicating with Hal on this over the past several months, and he has failed to comment only because he has lacked the time to get into the issue. At 76 he is still putting in 12-hour days six days a week fulfilling contracts and managing research in leading-edge physics. He is promising to give me a full statement in the next little while, and from his informal comments I can promise you that his response will be supportive of the scientific legitimacy and value of CRV.

Alfred Cota Hello Stephan... How are you. Yes, I agree that there has been many varient forms of what we call today Remote Viewing prior to the present usage under the accepted scientific criterior. "Scientific Repeatability" was achieved during The ASPR Beacon Experiments in Phase 2... which helped verify the Phase 1 experiments done by Ingo. The primary OOBE/Beacon experiment originally set up by Dr. Osis was based on previous psychical data... a good portion provided by Dr. Mason's research, that was published around 1897. As I understand, Dr. Osis approved some of Ingo's ideas to streamline the experiment. This too was approved by Dr. Osis, when I suggested some ideas as well. As a team participant, my involvement and contributing data is there as well.

Stephan A. Schwartz Daz, You came to this years after these events, were not in any way directly involved and can, at best, have second hand knowledge. if you think you know more than the scientist who actually ran the program longer than anyone else you are welcome to your delusions. Paul, I know you make a living teaching CRV, and have a vested interest in it, and so I can understand your position. There was nothing artful about my wording. I wrote Hal, and he chose not to make a statement. The fact remains that no scientist uses CRV, most don't even know it exists. There is nothing in the scientific literature supporting its claims, and the major remote viewers of record did not and do not use it. It exists only in the training-for-money pop RV world. I have tried to address a question that was directed to me in a responsible science based manner, have now done so, and will have nothing further to say on this subject.

Russell Targ We all agree that so-called CRV is an outgrowth of what could be called Ingo's SRI remote viewing (1972). It has been known since the writing of Padmasambhava in the eighth century* that "naming and guessing" are death to "spacious (timeless) awareness." As of 1983 there were more than 15 successful and highly significant Published replications of our original 1974 publication in /Nature/ (all cited in /Mind Race/). Hal and I at SRI, and Bob Jahn at Princeton published lengthy papers in the /Proceedings of the IEEE/ (1976 and 1982) describing additional highly significant remote viewing series. I am not aware of _any_ published papers, successful or not, describing CRV. Why is that? Published papers are the place that this argument should be taking place. Thought I am always up for a good argument.

Cheers,
Russell

*"Self Liberation Through Seeing With Naked Awareness." Snow Lion Publications, Ithaca, NY.

Alfred Cota Hello Russell... Thank you for the claification on your end. I had the impression that the "CRV" Remote Viewing Protocol method was coined during Your, Hal and Ingo's involvement at SRI? Question: Was the SRI RV Research a followup on what was done at the ASPR or was it an all different approach?

Fran Theis @Russell, Steven, Paul Perhaps the perspective of someone who has studied in one way or another with each of you, as well as having taken the course Skip used to teach that Joe now instructs and having taken a hard look at the Hawaiian method, will be of interest. Russell first introduced me to ARV in 1986, at which time he gave me the assurance that the natural abilities that were surfacing among my basically logical approach to life were perfectly normal. I'll forever be grateful for the work Russell, Hal and Ingo did to get the field to the point it was at by that time. As far as I'm concerned, they, and they alone, are the fathers of modern remote viewing. Later, my studies with Paul and the CRV he taught me gave me the total confidence to trust my intuition, and showed me that whether or not ALL the data CRV produced was correct, a certain proportion of it was absolutely right on the mark. In any case, CRV gave a logically minded natural the confidence to trust herself -- probably a similar sort of process that anyone who utilizes RV of any ilk must ultimately go through. At this point I use several methods for "being psychic", and suspect most others do, as well, simply because I have the hard-earned, well-trained confidence to do so. Gentlemen, I'm grateful to each of you for the work you do, the specialties you've developed, and the contributions to the field each of you have made. Each of the ways you work has been proven to have merit. Each of you are venerable contributors to the field. And each of you have helped provide the rest of us with a sound footing upon which to base our work. I've thanked you each before privately, but now I'd like to do so publicly. Thank you each for all you've done, and all you do.

Nathan Peters From what I can see most of the RV development these days is coming from the "pay-for-training pop RV" camp anyway. Mainstream scientists don't have much to do with it, except in isolated instances. Even then they are referencing older work that doesn't take into account cutting-edge RV developments. One exception being Courtney Brown's "Remote Viewing the Future" paper. I would think that new RV research would start with:
1. Finding out what the pop-RVers are doing, and then
2. Building a research project around it
...while realizing that the people skilled enough to potentially produce effects are a relatively small group that have been practicing for a number of years.

Fran Theis @Alfred Cota You may want to read the books Mind-Reach by Targ and Puthoff, The Mind Race by Targ and Harary, and Remote Viewers... by Jim Schnabel for the answer to the question you posed to Russell about his early work. The answer re their approach is spelled out precisely in those books, and will point to the part of their process during which they coined the label "Remote Viewing" to describe that approach to psychic functioning.

Paul H. Smith Stephan, if I may -- you make a living teaching folks _your_ version of RV, and have a vested interest in CRV not being any better than what your present. So I would say you are no more neutral in this issue than the rest of us. The fact of the matter is that Ed May was not the founder of the SRI program, nor did he have any significant role in CRV development so, with all due respect to Ed May (and he deserves a lot), in this particular matter he is _not_ an authority. Both he and Joe in the past have claimed that there is research showing that CRV is inferior as a methodology. In fact, they have _never_ been able to produce this alleged evidence for the rest of the world to evaluate independently, as is a requirement for scientific claims. And you are mistaken -- there is scientific evidence for the efficacy of CRV. Daz has presented some of it in the form of SRI documents from the Star Gate archives. You have not succeeded in refuting that evidence, nor has anyone else.

Paul H. Smith Dear Russell Targ -- public studies are lacking on CRV because the methodology and results from it were held secret for the balance of the program. When it was finally declassified, there was no longer funding nor interest to do rigorous publicly-accessible studies on it. However, the documentation that became available with the Star Gate archives is not at all useless in supporting the worthwhile nature of CRV, despite attempts by some to dismiss that literature merely because its existence is inconvenient to pet beliefs about the kinds of RV that are acceptable. The publications that you are (justly) proud of almost didn't see the light of day themselves. You had to make the case to _your_ funders, the CIA and (later) DIA to allow you to publish anything at all. Were it not for that, your evidence would be just as controversial as that for CRV.

Alfred Cota Hello Fran... Thank you, but in all due respect the coined word name "Remote Viewing" goes way back to about the turn of The Twentieth Century. I rather like to know why they re-chose that name and does it have to do with prior research that goes back to those days?

Paul H. Smith I might add one final point: Stephan A. Schwartz has a bit of a strawman argument going on here, though it is potentially not completely his fault. The claim (at least from responsible sources) has never been that CRV is _better_ than any other method -- which is the claim that Stephan repeatedly holds up as the target for his argument. Ingo himself never made this claim. What CRV was intended to be was a method to help naive, and perhaps relatively untalented subjects reach well-functioning RV levels more quickly and efficiently than they would have by trial and error (I believe I made this point in my presentation at the Paris RV conference in 2011, which you, Stephan, attended, and which we discussed briefly afterwards). I know there are some who are claiming it is the "best" method. But I agree that _this_ claim is without evidence and, likely, without merit (though without rigorous exploration it can't be dismissed altogether). But that is not a claim that most of us experienced CRVers support, hence its strawman qualities.

Paul H. Smith Al, I wish you would actually inform yourself about these subject areas instead promoting your own imaginary view of remote viewing history in which you prominently insert yourself without any evidentiary support or justification whatsoever. I will be happy to (figuratively) eat my computer if you can come up with any evidence whatsoever for the term "remote viewing" as referring to this particular kind of ESP before Ingo coined it in 1971. I think you will find that such evidence just doesn't exist.

Alfred Cota Hello Paul... In my direct involvement at the ASPR as a participant, the word "Remote Viewing" never came up from Dr. Osis who was Research Director of The RV-OOBE/Beacon Experiments.

Alfred Cota Paul... All these years, you continue to dis-inform. I don't need your approval, you need mine and the others that you continue to dismiss. Excuse for being blunt... I'm not here to have "P" match with you.

Paul H. Smith You're dodging the question, which was in response to your statement: "the coined word name 'Remote Viewing' goes way back to about the turn of The Twentieth Century," where is your evidence for this claim??? Saying that "Karlis Osis never said 'remote viewing'" has nothing to do with your statement or the question. If you have no evidence, stop making claims you can't support.

Fran Theis In answer to your question to me, Alfred, I urge you to read at the very least the three books I mentioned. One of the first things Stephan, among others, taught me is that the first step in understanding a field is to do a complete audit of the extant literature. You wouldn't have the questions, and probably some of the opinions, you have if you had done enough reading. Good luck with that!

Daz Smith Stephan A. Schwartz - Ed May did not run the program when CRV was studied, created and transferred as technology to the Military (1972-85) - it doesn't matter that I want there - i have read and continue to read and study the available literature - and as I presented and can continue to present - its not a single documents supporting CRV, but years of multiple documents and actions. if anyone is delusional tis you for ignoring these facts.

You claim 'there is nothing in scientific literature to support these claims' - im telling you that virtually every document i he Star Gate archives including many science papers and double blind studies, scientific oversight committee reports from at least 1979 - 1986 and probably far longer from the military side of things support CRV and training working and increasing yields - i have presented a small handful of these to you - including a couple a few posts ago - you cant refute this kind of documentation and there is alot of it.

Alfred Cota Hello Fran... I have an extensive library on this and other related research material. I may not know exactly to the ent degree everything, but I know enough about the history and my involvement... perhaps more in some areas than you give me credit for.

Stephan A. Schwartz I agreed to be one of the founders of IRVA precisely because I hoped that a popular movement would grow up that would follow the scientific protocols, thus, adding to our store of knowledge about nonlocal perception. Remote viewing experiments are cheap and easy to do. I thought by the end of the first decade there would be dozens, if not hundreds, of papers. I waited year after year, each year offering to help any group that was interested in doing a genuine study. It never happened. I don't know why.

Instead all the energy has gotten lost in a miasma of "training" with stages and phases. I would go to the conferences and hear people saying "I have just taken phase or stage four training," or some such. More and more the pop RV movement begun to resemble Scientology, with its expensive courses, tech language, and the rest.

To me this is very amusing because, in 1978, not long after Deep Quest, I sat with Ingo in the hot tub at the Pico-Burnside Bathhouse, on the corner of Pico and Burnside in Los Angeles – an old fashioned Russian Jewish schvitz. As we soaked in the hot water in a room filled with mists of steam, surrounded by elderly Jewish men talking Russian and Yiddish, and in the adjoining steam room, Ingo told me he was going to get the Army to fund him to create a Remote Viewing "corps," which he was going to model on Scientology – which at the time he was deeply involved with, as was Hal – and "I am going to be the L. Ron Hubbard of Remote Viewing." Later, at lunch, over skirt steaks, he told me more about his plans, and said he had even designed a badge for the viewer's uniforms like the Pathfinder or SEAL badges. On a napkin he drew me a picture of it. Somewhere in the old Mobius files in my storeroom I still have that little drawing.

At the time I thought this a grand fantasy of Ingo's but everything but the badge came to pass; and what has happened since the close of the Army project is even more a projection of that vision.

I have spent almost half a century studying nonlocal awareness in its various forms, have tested literally tens of thousands of people, through personal sessions with them, and through mass experiments in magazines like OMNI and LA Weekly. Most importantly I have worked with what I think are arguably the most highly and accurately tested viewers in the last four decades. Ingo himself, Hella Hammid, Judith Orloff, Alan Vaughan, Andre Vallaincourt, Michael Crichton, Ben Moses, Rosalyn Bruyere, George McMullen, Joe McMoneagle, Duane Elgin, and others. The body of work in which they participated, particularly in terms of operational applied Remote Viewing is without equal.

From all of that, those thousands upon thousands of sessions, I have concluded that "training" is of marginal utility at best. If one wants to be a good remote viewer the most important thing one should do is develop the daily practice of meditation. All nonlocal tasks hinge on the ability to achieve and maintain intentioned focused awareness. Nothing will do this as well as meditation, be it a martial art, or sitting Zen, or mindfulness. (Any one who is interested in why I say this can go to http://www.explorejournal.com/article/S1550-8307%2811%2900236-9/fulltext and download the pdf.) The idea that there is one uniform superior way to remote view, and that nonlocal perception data comes in some particular sequence to all people that can be trained is without substance. And I will say, again, sessions done that are not under double or triple blind randomized conditions are a waste of time.

**Meditation—The Controlled Psychophysical Self-Regulation Process That Works**

www.explorejournal.com

Paul H. Smith Stephan A. Schwartz you just repeated the same strawman that I accused you of using before, LOL -- that we CRVers claiming that "there is one uniform superior way to remote view." No truly knowledgeable CRVer makes this claim. And if you are trying to attack the discipline based on the claims of those of inadequate knowledge, then you are guilty of the same tactics that the skeptic community is by projecting the folk beliefs of "psychic fair" types onto scientific parapsychologists. I know you realize that is a logical fallacy, so why do it?

Simon Turnbull My feeling, as a somewhat objective observer, is that until there is a truly unified RV training syllabus organised, with all concerned parties bringing their methodologies to the table, RV will remain walking in the slow lane ... worrying about pedigree alienates those that truly love RV ... and I suddenly feel Ingo wants to say this, from his vantage point ... stop fighting about this ...

Paul H. Smith Simon Turnbull If Ingo does want to say this, then he has changed his mind since transitioning over. He was very passionate about defending the purity of the process and the efficacy of the training. He just wasn't so in public.

Simon Turnbull It's possible that death has changed his tune ...

Simon Turnbull As W.C. Fields said when he was caught reading the Bible on his death bed, "I'm just looking for loop-holes" ...

Simon Turnbull Hi Paul H. Smith , all I'm saying is everyone should take the bull by the tail and face the situation ...

Paul H. Smith Oh, Simon Turnbull that's just a bunch of bull!

Alfred Cota Hello Simon... I would like to send you a private message, Thanks

Palyne Gaenir Would people quit picking on the man? He's been gone for three days and already have to start in?

Simon Turnbull Sorry, I had to see a woman about a marriage ... Did I miss anything, apart from risking Palyne's ire? ...

Stephan A. Schwartz Paul, that is simply not true. I have heard you say, that CRV us a superior technique. I have heard Lyn say it. More importantly I have heard your students say it. Why did you choose to study CRV? "Because I wanted to learn the technique the Army/CIA used. I mean that has to be the best. Right?" I have been told severeal times at conferences. I heard Courtney Brown speaking at a conference last summer say, "CRV is how we get military grade remote viewing."

The entire predicate of CRV is just that: this is how you learn secret techniques the Army/CIA used. "I learned it as one the special corps of viewers trained by Ingo Swann, and I will teach it to you."

I just learned a few days ago, when Ed May wrote to me how ironic this statement appears to be: "There were serious problems with regard to Ingo's RV training not the least of which it was soundly rejected by all the main-line people at that time. In addition, without almost any exceptions, his "trained" Army people produced no intelligence for the Ft. Meade Unit. Almost all of it was obtained by non-Ingo-trained people." I didn't know that. The big SRI hits I knew came from Mind-Reach, General Dozier; the lost aircraft, the big crane, the new submarine. Apparently none of those were CRV.

For me, who created the protocols I used: Lab RV, ARV, Applied RV, with no reference to SRI or Ingo Swann -- I didn't know them and the SRI program didn't exist – CRV just didn't exist This was true the whole time I ran Mobius. It was a secret. My interest in it dates to the IRVA conference in New Mexico, at the Apache Reservation. You will remember it. Russ and I were asked to conduct an experiment. We insisted that it be double blind, and left the room while the session was conducted. And, after we explained how to do it, someone else selected an orthogonal target set to which we were blind until the session data and target images were presented to us, after a properly randomized target selection to which, of course, we were blind. Independent of the archaeological expeditions which remain incredibly numinous, of the several thousand lab sessions I have judged, perhaps 50 stand out in my mind, and that IRVA session is one of them.

I cannot speak for Russell, but I am sure he too had judged at least a thousand sessions. We did this routinely. But I had never seen full-on CRV session data, and was very interested in doing so.

All I really knew of CRV was that Ingo had adapted the Mobius Consensus Protocol's four point evaluation protocol: Correct, Partially Correct, Incorrect, Can't evaluation/no feedback , into CRV, just as is reported in the 1984 training paper. Although, it was only years later, when the paper was declassified, that I learned what he had done, and to what end. I just knew he was very interested in how I did Deep Quest, and he readily agreed to do The Alexandria Project, pre-fieldwork phase. And we did another project, my one intelligence project, Project Compass, to look at a secret KGB facility, for which he had coordinates. These projects were the basis of our friendship, and he came down several times to stay with me to watch me do an evaluation. That's what I knew about CRV. I don't know what Russ knew.

What I do know is that day at the conference we were stunned at the amount of paperwork that came in. Pages and pages. We were used to a single page, maybe two. We got something like 65 viewings I think, and you will remember it took us hours, with people coming in asking, "When will you be finished?" The second thing that stands out, is that there was not a single first place. We were dumbfounded. Neither of us had ever had that experience when a group RVed. That's what made me take notice of CRV.

At first I thought, well that's interesting and as IRVA became more and more a CRV organization, I thought, we'll now be able to revisit that experience and, through a some studies get up inside of CRV, for better or worse. That's what science is about and, if you're serious about understanding nonlocal consciousness, science is the way to go. It's like having pitons in the rockface. But that has never happened, as we both know. Russell says he too knows of no CRV papers in the literature. And asks: "Why is that?" Indeed, why is that? It can't be money; RV experiments are cheap, particularly when one has dozens of eager volunteers. So it can't be people either. It has to be something else? At first I was puzzled and, then, I just accepted it, as the reality it was and, then, I lost interest.

Let me be clear: I recognize and accept, even support, that my views about Remote Viewing is not the view. I can easily see CRV as a hobby, or as a door through which people pass to nonlocal consciousness. No matter what the technique people will condition and nonlocal perception will come through. History tells us that absolutely. It doesn't have to be science. It is a form of shamanism and, on those terms it will be a success.

I am taking the time to write all this down because, after meditating on it for a couple of days, I decided it was the right thing to do. When I began Remote Viewing, it never occurred to me that it would become a movement. It was a tool to access nonlocal consciousness, which is my real interest. Even when Mobius became just one of a bunch of labs -- SRI, Pear, MindScience, IONS -- doing Remote Viewing research I never thought that would happen. You and Lyn took the initiative on putting together the initial meeting that created IRVA, and remote viewers everywhere should thank you for that. You are the person more than anyone else who has moved the organization forward. Quite apart from the CRV issue it pleases me enormously that this has happened, because of the door function, and the historian part of me, wants a public record.

Simon Turnbull I have the greatest respect for all of you; Stephan A. Schwartz ,Paul H. Smith , Lyn Buchanan , Angela Thompson Smith, and Ingo Swann, etc., but my feeling all along has been that here is a treasure, RV, that needs to be put out there in a particular way, so that it becomes as accessible as something like Reiki ... in 1983, when Rev. Beth Gray first started to disseminate Reiki worldwide, she did one of her very first workshops at the Australian Psychics Association headquarters in Sydney ... she had a set of protocols, if you like, that she imparted to individuals and made it easy for them to get on with the business of getting it out there ... now look around you, just about everyone and their cat has heard of Reiki ... although they have their problems/issues politically speaking, it does not get in the way of people learning how to do it ... being a purist is not helpful if what you have to offer dies out with you ... I have very little ego invested in this, but my feeling is that Russell Targ has the right attitude, I've felt this all along ... but I'm sure that coming together, not simply under an umbrella like IRVA, but a genuine effort to make co-operation work, will save the day ... I am willing to help all of you out here to Australia regardless of what happens next if the circumstances allow, as I hope they will ... anyways, that's my story and I'm sticking to it ...

Daz Smith RV is accessible?
just stick to the rules/protocols - use what-ever-method you want to and just do it - how much more accessible can you get? There are tons of places to get free method, tips, targets, practice groups and mentoring - whats not accessible?

Angela Thompson Smith Well said, Simon!

Paul H. Smith I have to agree with Daz here, and disagree (a bit) with Simon. RV and Reiki are different species, and must be approached in different ways. Though the exact parameters are still far from understood, _how_ you do RV does matter. And the better you follow certain principles, the more concrete results you turn up. Unlike Reiki, there is an unmistakable correlation between a successful remote viewing effort and a concrete result. But though I have great respect for the healing arts, and really do believe there can be benefit, there is never _as clear_ a correlation between an attempt at Reiki and a positive outcome (in other words, there are always alternative explanations available to account for the healing result when there is one). This would suggest that it should be easier to get RVers to agree on method. Unfortunately, trying to get the different schisms of remote viewing to agree on a training approach would be like trying to get the Jehovah's Witnesses, Catholics, and Baptists to agree on the doctrine of trans-substantiation.

Palyne Gaenir Paul H. Smith wrote: "Though the exact parameters are still far from understood, _how_ you do RV does matter. And the better you follow certain principles, the more concrete results you turn up." --- A few, Paul. Only a few and they are not specific to CRV, XRV, whatever. Individuals are different. Some do horribly with CRV and some do wonderfully with it. People were doing RV in intelligence and science and around the world for over a decade before Ingo began with the (compiling, not so much inventing) of CRV. The most famous viewers in the world for documented results didn't use CRV. So the regular implying that this is somehow key to RV should be recognized as merely being apparently key to YOUR viewing (which if not fully blind I don't call RV), and those who use it successfully (I have). The problem in these discussions is that it becomes "CRV or not." That is a total red herring. The problem is people making claims for CRV (and its derivatives) that are inappropriate and sometimes untrue, and functioning so much like some psi-government version of The Church that a lot of people feel the knee-jerk reaction to defend from that. CRV would not need defense if people would quit promoting it like a religion, and often (not in this post of course) implying that without it nobody else is getting to heaven -- er, to accurate data. CRV works just fine for those who are suited to it, and other completely different approaches work just fine for those who are suited to them instead. I support all viewers regardless of method but it gets pretty weary how indoctrinated they are by you guys selling training. Not to mention having to try and re-educate them about protocol before they go in public and do yet more damage to the field's credibility (too late!).

Paul H. Smith Stephan Stephan A. Schwartz what yoou report Ed May as saying about the intelligence value of the non-CRVers vs. the CRVers is absolutely, abjectly, and ridiculously false. If he really said it in the way you seem to believe (and I'm giving him the benefit of the doubt, since I greatly respect the work he did at SRI/SAIC), then he was being intellectually dishonest as well. Ed had NO KNOWLEDGE of any consequence about what intelligence was being produced at Fort Meade, nor by whom. He had neither access nor need to know. During my seven years there, he came to Meade _once_ for _one day_ and it was about other matters, not about intelligence collection. And after mid-1984, neither did Joe McMoneagle, who also only visited once -- with Ed May. Did non-CRVers produce outstanding intel? Absolutely. Did CRVers? Just as absolutely. You say you read my book. In there, even without access to the full archives, I was able to report on and, to some extent, document a great deal of operational-level intelligence correctly reported by CRVers. Now with availability of the archives, there is still more evidence that you are wrong in this claim.

Palyne Gaenir I recall discovering in 1997 or so that May had 'oversight' on the unit and that those in the former unit (e.g. you and Lyn) hadn't known that and were shocked. If he did have oversight then he probably had a great deal of info about it, right? Isn't that what oversight means, in that regard... am I incorrect about the oversight element? Because as I recall, after some conversation I wasn't privy to among numerous people it appeared to have been accepted as a fact.

Paul H. Smith Stephan A. Schwartz With regard to the results presented at the first conference in New Mexico. I, too, was dismayed at the volume of results that were turned in. They did not at all reflect the best of what CRV produced at Ft. Meade. But they did reflect the differential effect of two things: Students who were less practiced than we would have liked. But the point at the time was to give them a chance to try out what they had learned in a circumstance in which they would get third party evaluation. That happened, but the results weren't pretty. The second thing was a bit dismaying to me. It was suddenly clearer what the consequences might be of individuals trying to put their own stamp on the methodology and tweaking the process in ways that suited them. It was evident that not everything works as well as someone may believe it does, and not everything stamped "CRV," is. But there is a third issue, which is that in a democratic field as RV has become, you get people from across the entire spectrum of learning ability and diligence. Under those circumstances, the results of even the best methodology are going to be mixed.

Alfred Cota Paul... In my opinion, the more you overdefend CRV, the more you not only make some... as well as myself in the Remote Viewing Community question it's true value, but it also distorts the real history of Remote Viewing. You know my background and my involvement in The history of RV... the same or similar documents I showed you are similar and the same as I showed Ret. Captain Robert E. Smith of Army Intel, Special Ops. who was at Ft. Bragg in the late 70's early 80's. Oh yes... he told me he knew about "Project Jedi" from special ops side and one of his assignments was "The Dozier Case". As I recall, you put down Glenn Wheaton as being a member of Special Forces and/or "Project Jedi" that was stationed at Ft. Bragg... Yes or no sir?

Paul H. Smith Huh?!? This is what Fran meant when she suggested it wouldn't hurt if you did some background reading before opining. You have jumbled all kinds of things up in your post. If you really do own the library you say you do, it wouldn't hurt to actually take some of it down off the shelf from time to time.

Alfred Cota Paul... You are so busted Sir. The more you sidestep The Real issues, the more you damage your credibility in the RV Community, by discounting and/or dismissing anyone that are Non-CRV trained RVers. Paul, During the height of "Project Stargate", there were as many as 14 labs researching what we call today Remote Viewing... and all those labs were NOT doing CRV.

Nathan Peters Alfred, Paul isn't diminishing his credibility anywhere. I don't even know what this long thread is about anymore...

Alfred Cota Hello Nathan... The original posting was wether or not Ingo Swann was "The Father of Remote Viewing", it had nothing to do with CRV or these other sidetracks that have occured on the way

Paul H. Smith Palyne Gaenir What? I have no idea what that means, that Ed May had "oversight." In fact, even though I AM 60 now, with the memory to match, LOL, I'm pretty sure it's the first I've heard of it. But it can't possibly be true in any sense other than from the perspective of research (which of course, is quite possible). That's not how the intel community works. Oversight, which is governed by federal statute, follows specific channels, and Ed wasn't part of any of them. He certainly has no intel training nor background, and so wouldn't have been qualified for that end of things.

Paul H. Smith Al, Ingo was _both_ the father of remote viewing AND the father of CRV. As far as the 14 labs -- I only know of a few. Please enumerate the 14...if you can.

Alfred Cota Paul... For the record, I think it is a nice honor to say such a title for Ingo, but it is not true. Have you reseached the clinical lab works Dr. Rufus Osgood Mason? As far as the 14 labs, I too am aware of a few, but this was twice broadcasted on ABC "I think it was Eye on LA or Eye on California" back in the mid 1980's about research on Remote Viewing being done at SRI.

Palyne Gaenir Well hang on. Much as I love beating up on Paul, Alfred that seems a little overdone. Yes he is too method-centric but that is his focus, and I say something to debate him only because I don't want things ever devolving to where they were in 1996 or where they had devolved to when I came back into the online field in 2002, everyone needs to know that "people vary." But if he's outright insulting anyone non CRV I haven't seen that or at least, not since the 'implied and/or by proxy' stuff that went on many years ago. Not for a long time. And I look for reasons to pick on him all the time (just

Alfred Cota For historical record... Dr. Rufus Osgood Mason http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rufus_Osgood_Mason was an early Pioneer Psychical Research Contributor to The Society for Psychical Research and The American Society for Psychical Reseach. His clinical research speaks for itself. Much of his clairvoyant/OOBE research are the foundations of what we call today Remote Viewing. Anyone... including Ingo Swann had access to his reseach at The ASPR. The similarity to Dr. Mason's research and most RV Methodologies (Including CRV) are most strikingly similar.

Palyne Gaenir 1. Foundations of RV is not RV. Eye of Newt is the foundation of medicine, too. 2. Yes CRV has similarities to many basics that lab psychics had long known because it was compiled from what one exceptional lab psychic thought would work. (The discussion on that is separate, but the point is, the similarities do not devalue it.)

Paul H. Smith This venue is, unfortunately, getting too unwieldy to discuss increasingly nuanced points about CRV, RV, etc., so I think I'm going to bow out of the discussion for now.

Paul H. Smith @al moch (aka Alfred Cota) Interesting that you link a Wikipedia entry about Osgood that you yourself wrote and edited, asserting the remote viewing claim but linking to no evidence for that claim. All I see so far are references to telepathy and death-survival -- both worthy topics in their own right, but not overly germane to the discussion here. Indeed, the one directly relevant work linked there contains the following passage: "While Mason's cases are interesting, he was not a major contributor to the empirical data base of nineteenth-century psychical research. His main contribution was his efforts to popularize the field in the United States, with particular attention to the work of the SPR, and the subliminal psychology of Myers." It doesn't sound like Mason was the "father" of anything, though I'm sure a worthy guy who made some valuable contributions. Indeed, even if he _had_ introduced a proto-RV protocol, it certainly disappeared with him. One of the main criteria for being the "father" of something is that it live on after you.

Alfred Cota Paul... Again you are so busted. Still trying to indirectly insult me and my research eh I first found Dr. Mason's information and Bio one day in a book that was published around 1935 Called "The Geneology of Capt. Hugh Mason" by William Bond. Most of his Bio comes from it. Check http://www.kinnextions.com on Mason Family.

Palyne Gaenir How many names does this dude have?? And is there any topic besides Moch the Glorious ?

Palyne Gaenir Anything over-claimed and over-presented is going to get some response to bring it to balance. Seeing that as insult is as unbalanced as the original presentation. You diss it for CRV but not for yourself. Really people mostly want to talk about viewing as opposed to how wonderful one of your many identities allegedly was at some very distant point back in time. And for godssakes stop dissing Ingo for the moment can't the man be dead for a week or two before the tackle?

Alfred Cota I personally gave some of my documentation to Angela years ago and Paul knows who I am... I think you're may be in denial.

Palyne Gaenir Yes because you are so incredibly important that it requires psychological problems on the part of anybody who does not share your messianic image of yourself.

Paul H. Smith I know who you are, but I have never seen any credentials or evidence for your claims -- and for the record, no argument about claims to remote viewing's "fatherhood" were ever resolved between you and me. Indeed, I have no recollection of any discussion we've had under that particular description.

Stephan A. Schwartz Whatever else CRV is, or is not, one thing is certain: CRV and the Stargate program played no role whatever in the development of the science of remote viewing. In the 70s through 90s when the heavy lifting about nonlocal perception was being worked out in its modern form, most scientists did not even know CRV existed. Many still don't. It has no presence in science, and must be seen as an alternate universe. As to Paul's request for a list of the labs: SRI (CRV was a tiny part of the SRI/SAIC program), Princeton Engineering Anomalies Research Group, Mobius, Mind Science, University of Edinburgh, Institute for Noetic Sciences, and Bay Research, are seven that immediately come to mind. For anyone who really wants to know what remote viewing is about go to my personal website www.stephanaschwartz.com and download the remote viewing bibliography you will find there, that Vernon Neppe, MD, PhD and I put together. It lists every scientifically sound publication we could track down.

Simon Turnbull I have to agree with Palyne Gaenir in respect that there are many different ways but the same target (I'm sounding like St. Paul, if you'll forgive the pun) ... The only other major issue is the protocol/ rules element ... Surely everyone can agree on that? ... (Table thump) ... So what's the beef? ... The rest of the story is how one promotes RV to outsiders ... and I'm not referring to the converted media (Coast to Coast, etc.) ... That requires everybody to be on the same page ... A united front ...

Paul H. Smith Stephan A. Schwartz Yup, all those efforts were on my radar. What I was questioning is whether the list would add up to the 14 Al Moch claimed. But as far as your revisionist history of remote viewing is concerned, you've got the wrong end wagging the dog. Who do you think provided the funding for the West Coast part of the remote viewing program? SRI and (in the end) SAIC didn't grow that money on trees, and they certainly didn't get it from private or corporate donations. It was almost ALL DoD money (and what wasn't came from other three-letter agencies), much of it directly from the Services. Who were the contract monitors? After the CIA got out of it, Army officers and DoD civilians working for either Air Force, Army, or DIA. Does that sound like the military side of things (the Star Gate program -- note, two words, not one) was a minor player? The Star Gate program was driving the train. But I've told you this before in other venues.

Simon Turnbull Why does who did what to whom matter so much ... I am one perplexed puppy ...

Simon Turnbull When I make love to a woman (in this case my wife), I don't care what position we take, so long as we both climax ...

Angela Thompson Smith Well, that shut everyone up, Simon, LOL

Stephan A. Schwartz There seem to be two lists going. One on Yahoo, the other FB. I don't use
social media much, so am not quite sure what is where. That said:

Daz, as to the timing of my comments: They were driven by the comments of others. I almost held off responding, because of Ingo's death, but realized, from my own experience as an historian, that some future historian would be going through all this, and that if I didn't post, her work would be made more complicated. I have over 200 banker boxes full of primary documentation on the whole remote viewing story, as well as four books, and a couple of dozen papers, and some day that historian will be going through those as well. I don't care whether you believe me or not. My interest lies in getting certain things on the record. They are all documented, but context demanded some additional comments.

I don't know you except through your posts. I am sure you are well-intended, you clearly have put a lot of time into studying the Stargate archives, but you are profoundly mis-informed. You know some of the notes, but not the song. I lived all these events, know all the players. I have been at this since 1966, and have four decade long relationships with the SRI researchers, as well as all the other remote viewing researchers, of whom many in CRV seem to know nothing.

As you can tell from his comments, Russell's views are much like mine, and so are Ed May's. This morning I got this from Ed: "Russ Targ forwarded some of your remarks about IRVA and training. I find that I am in agreement with almost everything you have to say." The truth is, Daz that those documents you think you understand are but one small layer of a much more complex picture, beginning with the fact that the Stargate Ft. Meade project was only a tiny part of the SRI/SAIC program. I know from listening at 10 years of IRVA conferences that in the pop RV world Stargate is all. In fact, Stargate and CRV constitute something like an alternate universe. They played no role whatever in the development of modern remote viewing. I am always amazed that no one in CRV world seems to find it odd, or important, that none of the remote viewing scientists, or viewers of note, use it. Why do you think that is?

Paul, it is correct that various government agencies funded SRI/SAIC, but it does not follow that much of it had anything to do with CRV or Stargate. In fact, it did not.

It is also clear to me from reading all these posts that in CRV world few seem to know who the real players are. Just one example, since Daz and Paul have both posted dismissive remarks about him. Your comments reveal a startling ignorance as to who Ed May is, what his role was at SRI, or SAIC, (SAIC doesn't seem to register in the CRV world), or his enormous contributions in the field of consciousness research. And why is it there is almost no reference on these lists to the work of Bob Jahn, Roger Nelson, Brenda Dunne, Dean Radin, Elmer Gruber, Marilyn Schlitz, Chuck Honorton, Caroline Watts, or Deborah Delanoy, all of whom made important contributions to remote viewing research.

Simon Turnbull Ah, hah ...

Angela Thompson Smith Somewhere I have a diagram of the RV Family Tree with links and groupings etc. I'll have to try and find it. I made it with Viseo which I no longer have, but still have a printout.

Angela Thompson Smith Found it, its out of date and incomplete but I will post it on the Mindwise Consulting Facebook Page. Look for the RV Family Tree. Not sure how to post it here or even if it is appropriate for this venue, but I'll try.

Simon Turnbull I can understand that accuracy as to historical events is important ... and issues of who carries a legacy are also important (at least to the carrier) ... but after all is said and done, bad feeling of any kind will only serve to dilute the furtherance of the dissemination of RV to the masses, who in turn reward those who successfully do the marketing ... II have a client who is worth over $100 mil who is looking at a way to find commercial applications using RV ... he is serious, and to that end we are looking for psychics who are already accurate using their current methodologies, but who will also consider learning RV in order to further refine their abilities ... my thoughts are to steer these people towards other trainers, as I only teach one-on-one ... and am much better suited to promoting this project ... We call it the Paracom Project at this stage ... part of our concern is how to properly present trainers; issues of cost of courses and finding a way of marketing RV worldwide would require a unified approach ... I know that some people diminish the commercial aspects of RV, wanting only to focus on the academic pursuit of the subject, but the realities are that even a scientist needs to eat now and then (although most seem to be skinny) ...

Jade Cadeliña Malcolm, Is your client a Sydney based venture capitalist?

Simon Turnbull You rascal, you ...

Jade Cadeliña LOL!! I have no interest in taking your client. There's to much pressure when working with VC's who wants an ROI in less than 12months.

Stephan A. Schwartz Simon, you should look at the Mobius Consensus Protocol, spelled out in detail in my book Opening to the Infinite and several papers. It is a proven and highly successful applications protocol.

Lyn Buchanan At 2/5/2013 ( Tuesday ), Paul wrote:
>With regard to the results presented at the first conference in New Mexico. I, too, was dismayed at the volume of results that were turned in. They did not at all reflect the best of what CRV produced at Ft. Meade.

The "judging" done at that conference was so totally skewed as to be disgraceful. The judging was supposed to have been done by the 5-target comparison method first, then by the individual perception method second, in order to compare the two methods of judging. What actually happened was that they got together and did their judging on the 5-target comparison method, and then pronounced the viewing a bust. I was never allowed to score the sessions for correct/incorrect perceptions. The target was the Queen's bedroom, and in fact, one of the viewers had a top-flight session summary, describing it quite well. I was told that it was wrong, simply because (they said) CRVers can only view outdoor targets, so the session which clearly described an indoor scene could not have been considered, and was therefore thrown out. I was not allowed to see any of the other session summaries before John and (I think it was Russ) went out and made their announcement that the CRVers had failed. It was a total kangaroo court session, and as far as I am concerned, caused me to lose a ton of respect for the researchers involved.

Lyn Buchanan At 2/5/2013 ( Tuesday ), Alfred wrote that his source of information: >.....was twice broadcasted on ABC

Well, then!!!! Surely it MUST be true!!! Right???

Lyn Buchanan At 2/5/2013 ( Tuesday ), Stephan wrote:
>Paul, that is simply not true. I have heard you say, that CRV us a >superior technique. I have heard Lyn say it.

Sorry, but I have always contended that there are many roads to what we are doing, and that the advantage of CRV is that it is simply 30+ years farther down the road. Add scientific oversight and 30 years of in-the-trenches experience to almost any of the other methods and you'll have a good and viable protocol. I would suspect that it will be the same protocol that CRV has now, because we've made our mistakes and follow-on corrections, but who knows? In the process of developing, it's possible - or even probable - that the will discover something that CRV has overlooked, in its specifically military applications. I've just always said that the main benefit of CRV is that we are simply 30+ years of experience and scientific oversight farther down the road.

Lyn Buchanan At 2/5/2013 ( Tuesday ), Stephan wrote:
>Whatever else CRV is, or is not, one thing is certain: CRV and the Stargate program played no role whatever in the development of the science of remote viewing.

Well, maybe it did contribute a little to the science - like trying it out in real operations - like finding out that certain laboratory findings didn't work in the field - like refining laboratory protocols that hindered the process of getting things done in the real world - like developing the use of remote viewing in situations where it dealt with customers, was worked in teamwork situations, was analyzed, judged, and critiqued by its customers instead of by people in lab coats lining up 5 targets and having people guess which one the session target was - like producing usable and immediate results for customers who were waiting in the hallway......well, I'm sure that if a researcher says we didn't contribute anything to the
science by taking it out of the lab and into the world, then it must be true.

But let's be fair and add that with the one glowing exception of the Omega group's real-world work, the researchers in the lab added nothing to advance the science of remote viewing as an actual usable application outside their labs. There are two sides to this.

Simon Turnbull Hi Stephan A. Schwartz , I believe I'm short two of your books to bring me up to date ... Will get them ...

Alfred Cota Hello Lyn... How are you

Stephan A. Schwartz Is that a fact, Lyn? You think Russell Targ and I don't know how to judge an RV session? And as for operational RV: When you produce something even remotely similar to Cleopatra's Palace, or Deep Quest, or the Lancaster murder covered on Nova, or a dozen other similar projects do let us know, please. As to your performance and Stargate I will defer to May who said, "... without almost any exceptions, his "trained" Army people produced no intelligence for the Ft. Meade Unit. Almost all of it was obtained by non-Ingo-trained people." Or perhaps you don't think Ed knows what he is talking about either. Let's see, Russell, Ed, and myself, all don't know what we are doing. That's it, I am out of here. I have a deadline on a paper due in four days, and this is no longer productive.

Paul H. Smith Stephan A. Schwartz Why are you ignoring what I said about the falsity of Ed May's assertion about intelligence collection at Fort Meade? There are two factors essential in intelligence collection for information to be trustworthy: placement, and access. Ed May had neither with regard to either the type or quality of intelligence collected at Fort Meade, and by whom it was collected. So either you are misquoting Ed, or Ed is misleading you. I'll leave it for the two of you to sort out which it is.

Simon Turnbull And we cleaned that up ...

Pat McDonald "You think Russell Targ and I don't know how to judge an RV session?" - it is somewhat problematic to judge a session without knowing what the target was. So yes Stephen, I would have to say that both you, Russel Targ, and anybody else might have issues judging a session. That's not to say there would be issues judging EVERY session. But some sessions/targets are highly problematic. The best example I can give of that is the Ingo Jupiter probe... nobody knew at the time that Jupiter has photographable rings around it, so when Ingo said "planet has rings around it", that was judged as a miss. Even though it was in fact, accurate. My point is, any particular session/target, when judged, is judged by the knowledge and experiences of the judge. Judges are human beings, and human beings make mistakes.

Sandy Frost Tsk. Tsk. Ingo dies and the pissing contests start. Honor his memory and his place in the evolution of parapsychology. Let's move on to a better future that he helped unlock.

Lyn Buchanan Sandy is right. This is little more than a pissing contest. This thread started out with someone challenging Ingo as "The Father of Remote Viewing". He wasn't. I talked to him about that title when I was visiting him, and he even said that he didn't like the term, and wanted the others who were also responsible to get the credit, too.

But the fact is that in everyone's mind, the title belongs to him. A lot of the right people won't get the title, and may deserve it more. And, if any one of them claimed it, the pissing contest would just start all over again. But in the minds of the general public, Ingo has the title. That's life. Everyone else who would covet the title is just going to have to live with it. People will always know Ingo as "The Father of Remote Viewing". That's just the way it is.

Lyn Buchanan At 2/6/2013 ( Wednesday ), Stephan wrote:
>As to your performance and Stargate I will defer to May who said, >"... without almost any exceptions, his "trained" Army people produced no intelligence for the Ft. Meade Unit.

One might ask why Ed May thought we were "his" people. We weren't. Besides that, how would he know what we produced? It wasn't done for him, he wasn't cleared for it, and it was turned in to our customers. As for him ever seeing it - as far as I know, he didn't.

As for his idea of "trained", that was a continuing and serious bone of contention between him and me, anyway. He actually had no idea of what our training was or what we did, and like I say, he never saw the results of it because it wasn't sent to him. It was sent to our customers. He wasn't over us, and only came to the unit one time in all the years I was there. That one time when he did come in, he came over to my desk with a beaming smile and said that he had developed a new and wonderful cueing technique. To show it to me, we sat down at a desk with him playing the monitor role, to cue me. I got pen and paper ready, and we sat there in silence for a while, me waiting with pen on the paper for the cue. All of a sudden, he screamed at the top of his lungs, "TARRRGGGETTTTTT!!!!!" I naturally just about jumped out of my skin, and when I did, he pointed to the scratch of ink across the paper and said, "See!! An Ideogram!"

Nathan Peters "TARRRGGGETTTTTT!!!!!" lol, well that is one way to get a spontaneous ideogram

Paul H. Smith To be literally accurate, Ingo always said that it was _Hal Puthoff_ that was the "father of remote viewing." Hal, on the other hand, insists that Ingo deserved most of the credit. I have to agree. However, to add yet another dimension to this -- Ingo was never hesitant to give credit where it was due for the mix of ideas that led to his development of remote viewing. Rene Warcollier figured large in that, along with Upton Sinclair, and numerous others. Those who have not become familiar with these folks' work are missing some important understandings about remote viewing principles. NONETHELESS, it took someone with the insights, introspection, acute observational abilities, and self-confidence (among many other qualities), to put all the pieces together and come up with a protocol and a system of this nature that was both successful and enduring. No one else had done that before. In this respect he was like Edison, who thanks to the work of those who went before, was able to come up with unique new realizations that changed the face of society as we know it. Remote viewing hasn't done that yet, but it seems to be on the way. Despite his deference to others, Ingo was nevertheless the father of remote viewing, no matter how you want to parse it.

Fran Theis This is the most amazing thread -- I've cried and laughed, sometimes at the same time. What a blend of wisdom, nonsense, experience, reality, and total craziness all at once. Ingo would have been entertained by all -- and probably embarrassed to accept the title of Father of Remote Viewing. But like Lyn and Paul, I think the title will stick through history.

Alfred Cota Hello Paul... If you insist on calling Ingo "The Father of Remote Viewing", then you just have to start calling me and the other Pioneer Remote Viewers and scientists that worked next or along side Ingo "Uncles of Remore Viewing".

Russell Targ Dear Paul,
I think you strike exactly the right note. Ingo was certainly guided by Sinclair and Warcollier, whose books he copious underlined. And Edison had many important antecedents as well. But without Ingo there would not be the 2.5 million pages of "remote viewing" in Google that there are today. Ingo taught Hal and me how to do remote viewing in 1972. We taught the army in 1978, and the army taught the world. Remote viewing must be a success since it has so many fathers. But it is obvious that
Ingo is its father in the modern day. I won't dwell on it here. But you all know that the Hindus and Buddhists of past millennia wrote on our favorite subject with significant and penetrating insight. We still have much to learn from Patanjali and Padmasambhava. It is shocking to me, as I continue to realize how much more they knew than we know today.
Russ

On 2/6/2013 9:18 AM, Paul H. Smith wrote:

Alfred Cota Hello Russell... In all our many serious and querky ways, I don't see us truly being negative toward Ingo as a person. Yes... togeter as a team member and on his own, he accomplished much, and that can't be taken away from him. On the otherhand, in my reseach of the origins of what would become present day Remote Viewing, I credit some of it to what was written and observed by an individual named Staff Sgt. Edgar A. Perry (aka: Edgar Allan Poe), who went to The United States Military Academy at West Point for a time, and sortly after was working at The U.S. War Department. He had access to U.S. Intelligence at the time, by way ONI and some of his writtings show that he was trained in some crypto-code writting... perhaps a maker and breaker of codes. Alas... Poe might have been the Ingo Swann of his day, but he had no scientist or medical authority. Another person that I support as being "The Father of Present Day Remote Viewing" is Dr. Rufus Osgood Mason, who interacted with both the Society for Psychical Research and The American Society for Psychical Research in his day. Dr. Mason"s work is welll noted and has been a model for reasearch at the ASPR to say the least! Dr. Mason's 1897 published work "Telepathy and The Subliminal Mind" has a chapter on Clarvoyance (along with illustrations) that are strikingly similar to many of the present day Remote Viewing Protocols today! Anyone at the ASPR... including Ingo would have had access to Dr. Mason's research.

Daz Smith some one please admin Alfred Cota this is getting silly - he has no respect.

Alfred Cota Paul... Some years back, when I saw one of your original web pages boasting that Ingo Swann was "The Father of Remote Viewing" I addressed you about it. Not too long after, I noticed it was removed. I assumed we had a mutual understanding. During the time... I tried to find an answer to "Who was The Father of Remote Viewing", so just for a lark I desided to Remote View the question and see what I got... and it wasn't Ingo Swann. I did RV a person... It was able to identify it as Dr. Rufus Osgood Mason.

Lyn Buchanan At 2/6/2013 ( Wednesday ), Paul wrote:

>NONETHELESS, it took someone with the insights, introspection, acute >observational abilities, and self-confidence (among many other qualities), to put all the pieces together and come up with a protocol and a system of this nature that was both successful and enduring.

Right. In all this, people seem to forget that there is a difference between "remote viewing" and Ingo's "Controlled (or Coordinate) Remote Viewing.

"RV" is a way for psychic-talented people to organize and improve their functioning.

"CRV" is an "interview and report" protocol (interview your subconscious mind with cueing, etc. and then write down the information that comes back) that Ingo designed and developed in such a way that the military could grab some random soldier off the battlefield, and whether he/she had ever had a "psychic event" or not, could teach that soldier to do the work of a top-flight psychic.

The basic difference is: "RV" is for psychics. "CRV" is for people who aren't psychics. Like Paul says, it took someone with the insights, introspection,acute observational abilities, and self-confidence (among many other qualities), to put all the pieces together and come up with a protocol and a system of this nature that was both successful and enduring --- for people who aren't "psychics".

Ingo wasn't the first person in the world to study psychic functioning. But right off, I can't think of any other person who "fathered" it to the world.

So, if being the first is what determines who gets the title, why don't we just say that the "Father of Remote Viewing" was Ourgq (the first shaman in the first caveman society who taught his secrets to his son), and let it go at that. We should have a portrait for the Remote Viewing Hall of Fame.....

|--------------------------------------------|

| Ourgq, "Father of Remote Viewing" |

| ...........(photo unavailable) ................| |________________________________|

As for my practical way of thinking, Ingo "fathered" my own personal skills, so I really don't care who else did what or when.

This is silly. Why don't we move on to a more sensible thread.

Lyn Buchanan At 2/6/2013 ( Wednesday ), Alfred wrote:
>Hello Paul... If you insist on calling Ingo "The Father of Remote >Viewing", then you just have to start calling me and the other >Pioneer Remote Viewers and scientists that worked next or along side >Ingo "Uncles of Remore Viewing"

I look back over what I've learned and how I've grown mentally, as well as spiritually because of what CRV has done for me, and I tend to think of myself as a "child of remote viewing".

Simon Turnbull I'm sorry to read that CRV is not for psychics ... That's the kind of thinking that will turn CRV into a dodo ... Unless the idea is being presented that psychics can join the queue winding around the block waiting to get into a course ... It 's hard enough at the moment to get psychics to learn RV ...

Sandy Frost I like that, Lyn. We're all "children of remote viewing." Native Americans practiced such psychic techniques for everyday survival, blended with spirituality. Was there intervention from our "creator gods" through people like Ingo or Lyn or Joe or Skip to open up our "Seventh Sense" and beyond? I think this was the unintentional consequence of the RV unit, the spiritual evolution of these soldiers partly through the UFO/ET work done at Ft. Meade. This is the gorilla in the room. What if certain individuals interested in UFO/ET technology for military applications were involved in the formation of the unit and used the viewers to gather such information for military/political advantage? A word to the wise? It's not nice to piss off the psychokinetic of the group. *points to Lyn*

Simon Turnbull The prejudice against psychics is not justified, it's simply elitist ... Talk about pissing off the 'psychokinetic of the group' ... How 'bout we all agree that CRV can be presented as an advanced form of RV, and all get behind being more inviting where psychics are concerned ... and I'm talking about professional psychics in the first instance, of whom I have a good understanding of ... They are not all into fairies at the bottom of the garden ... in dac

Pat McDonald If I was thinking to name parents of remote viewing, I would say RV is a lovechild of science and cold war politics. Factors, rather than people. I'm not saying that the people doing and researching those factors and ideas were not vital. Of course the people were vital. But why rate one particular person as of vital import to the whole subject? Wasn't everybody "important" to one degree or another?

James Vitale I INVENTED REMOTE VIEWING! Oh, wait! No I didn't! It's an AWESOME mind tool however!

Thanks Russell, Hal and Ingo! Rest in peace fellow sojourner.

Tko Seven: read "Remote Viewing the Real Story" or "Everybody's Guide to Natural ESP" both by Ingo Swann or the intro to the Rene Warcollier book by Ingo Swann ...if you want more credit or attention for what you've done in life, then do more for everybody else and the world

INGO ROX HARDCORE

and I'm really super glad to have learnt so many things that are directly linked to things that Ingo dominoed for me Ingo is the father of Remote Viewing whether or not he or anyone even claimed so...of course Remote Viewing has been going on for at least thousands of years, however because of what he did, and was developed by the team inspired on/by/with what he did, I learned a simple, direct, and efficient Remote Viewing method, because of what he helped develop... and noone else managed to get that ball rolling so that I would receive it in 2010when I was looking for it since 1978and if you read the previously cited works you'll see that Ingo gives ample credit for/to many others for the development of Remote Viewing, correct or not, encyclopedic or not, hell yeah Ingo is the father of Remote Viewing ! and the more I can get his word and work out, it's on brudda

AOL dude . . .

Lyn Buchanan At 2/6/2013 ( Wednesday ), Simon wrote:

>I'm sorry to read that CRV is not for psychics ...

Sorry. I have come to realize that every sentence in English can be taken in different ways. I just keep forgetting. Hopefully, this will be more clear.....

"RV" is what psychics do. It used to be called by other names, now, it's all just "RV". It's "crystal ball RV", "Palm RV", etc. Anything and everything psychic is now "RV".

"CRV", on the other hand, is a process with protocols and mental tools that allows a person who is not a "psychic" to do the work of one - and a good one, at that. It also allows natural psychics to become better at what they do naturally. While I was teaching classes in my home, I would try to have at least one class a year called, "CRV for psychics". I found that one of the major problems psychics have is a lack of control over their talent. They often feel that they are "at its mercy", etc. Well, for that class, I would teach the controls, and not the remote viewing. When we get natural psychics who become in total control of their talents, it is like watching Fred Astaire and Ginger Rogers dance... It is incomparable!!! I would teach this class and then watch as the good natural psychics would use the controls to take off and soar!!! I would sit there watching, realizing that on my very best day, I couldn't hold a candle to what they were doing. The practicality of CRV is that it is a set of mental disciplines that will allow anyone to become a viewer - and a good one. But the >>beauty<< of CRV is not as much in the RV as it is in the control that it gives you.

The great accomplishment of CRV is that it allowed (and still allows) people of all walks of life and all levels of natural ability to get in touch with their own subconscious minds and become more than they ever thought they could be. Why will I always call Ingo the "Father of Remote Viewing"? Because everyone else who has tried to teach people to "be psychic" has always relied on a person's natural talent. Almost like the old cartoon of two vultures sitting on a limb and one says to the other, "Wait, hell! I'm gonna go kill something!" Ingo basically said, "Let it happen, Hell! I'm going to teach people how to MAKE it happen!" And he did.

>That's the kind of thinking that will turn CRV into a dodo ...

What? To say that CRV will let anyone who wants to become greater than they are will make it extinct? I don't see the reasoning there.

>Unless the idea is being presented that psychics can join the queue >winding around the block waiting to get into a course ...I really wish that people would get off the accusations that the only thing trainers want is to get people's money. I could have stayed with computer programming and made 3 times what I've made teaching CRV. I gave up money to do this job. I think that there is something wrong with people when they are so suspicious of others' intentions that they cling tightly to those suspicions, rather than looking to see what's real. Please give it up.

Lyn Buchanan At 2/6/2013 ( Wednesday ), Simon wrote:

>The prejudice against psychics is not justified, it's simply elitist ...

Sigh!!! How can I ever get across to people whose minds are already made up to the contrary that a person who has to resort to CRV has to do so because the natural talent just isn't there? I've said this many, many times, and yet, people filter and twist everything to fit their own preconceived way of thinking. CRV is NOT prejudiced towards natural psychics. CRVers hope to learn to become one. Could you please let go of your prior defenses and just listen to what we've been saying, all along? I hope so.

>Talk about pissing off the 'psychokinetic of the group' ... How 'bout we all agree that CRV can be presented as an advanced form of RV,

I don't agree. CRV is, if anything, a mechanistic form of RV, and as such, it is a lower form. The fact that it can teach a "non-psychic" person to reach his/her full potential makes it wonderful for humanity, simply because it makes it so the talent no longer belongs only select groups - why, by the way, are always defensively looking down on CRV, putting it down, and working very hard to ignore it's potential for them, as well.

>and all get behind being more inviting where psychics are concerned and I'm talking about professional psychics in the first instance, of whom I have a good understanding of ...

Wonderful. Now, if you would also open your mind up and try understanding CRVers, as well, it would go very far towards a more cohesive and agreeable community. We're all working for the same goal. Why can't we work towards it together? If you take a clear look, you might finally be able to see that the elitism has been more on the part of those who treat CRV with suspicion, fear, and simply put, an elitist attitude.

Paul H. Smith Those are Lyn's views on psychics, remote viewing, and CRV. My take would be considerably different in certain respects. But we've _never_ agreed on everything. What would be the fun in that?

Simon Turnbull First of all, let me say that I love Lyn Buchanan and Paul H. Smith , not so much for who they are, but because of the passion they both have for RV, and no matter what either of them ever say on the subject of RV, it will not change that love ... Lyn, RV is not what psychics do, there is no such thing as crystal ball RV either ... there are people on the web, rip off merchants, perhaps, who make claims that their abilities are RV based when they're not, that is true ... but you cannot tar everyone with the same brush ... though I can immediately understand your motivations for being a tad 'pissed off' with those people ... but they are in the minority, and will most likely be back washing dishes next week when their clients find them out ...

Simon Turnbull Secondly, It is true that many psychics, amateurs and even some professionals, lack control over their psychic abilities, and as you say, are subject to their mood swings ... however, professionals of my calibre (started in 1970; that's 43 years and counting, longer than most people in this group have been alive, I'll warrant) are far more disciplined than you give us credibility for ... discipline comes with daily practice ... day in, day out ... and there are many like me out there ... you can't teach people to be psychic, they already are ... you can only teach people to improve and refine their, as you put it, 'natural' abilities ...

Simon Turnbull Thirdly, to call CRV a 'lower form' of RV due to it's mechanistic nature is to diminish its worth ... It is precisely because it is mechanistic that it enhances a psychic's ability, because it gives them the discipline that some may not yet have developed over the passage of time ... in effect, it speeds up their ability to develop a more disciplined, or as you put it, controlled psychic experience ... psychics need that, even many professional psychics of my acquaintance, which is precisely why I am here writing to you right now ... I sense, Lyn, and believe that you really do want to to work 'towards a more agreeable and cohesive community' ... As Paul says, we may not be ever able to agree as a group entirely, but my wish is that we can agree, once we recognise our differences more fully, to be able to market RV to everyone's mutual advantage ...

Simon Turnbull Which brings me to my final point ... there is a lot to praise you for in taking the path you have chosen; to give up a more financially rewarding income-earning device for the passion you indisputably have for RV (CRV) ... I understand this because I chose the same path, which is a spiritual choice, and which you will be rewarded for ... I myself could have been a great hooker, one of the best ... (in Australia, a hooker is a footballer; ah, never mind) ... the point is, there's nothing wrong with making money ... so my multi-millionaire clients tell me ... and if we play our cards right, we may be able to make a packet yet without feeling guilty about it ... the client I mentioned earlier, whom you have met here in Sydney at the talk you gave, has taken a long time to get to the point of wanting to proceed with finding ways to apply RV towards commercial applications ... I'm sure you remember him ... he also has a passion for parapsychology, and considerations such as age and for other reasons wants to leave a legacy in this field, and I have convinced him that remote viewing is where it's at, but I need a little help here ... as you can see, I am very open about this as I feel there is nothing to lose and everything to gain ...

Daz Smith Simon Turnbull - remote viewing itself and the practice of CRV is IMO a stage above what natural psyhics do - when moving into remoet viewing you are making a statement that you will form now on work in a manner whereby every single psychic project you participate in is done under strict controls proving to yourself, anyone involved, clients and skeptics that THE only source to the information given by the intuitive is intuition.

Natural psychics for the most dont/wont/ and mostly cant work this way - and IMO the vast majority because of this have no way of proving if what they do is even psychic - from my personal experiences and these are of 30 years of clairvoyance, mediumship and much more at all levels, MOST people claiming to be psychic are just cold reading, reading natural body language and many other forms of human communication.

I believe those who are BRAVE enough to work under the banner of being a remote viewer are working towards proving their intuitive abilities every single time - this is what differentiates RV/CRV form natural psychic ability - we, every day strive to prove 100%, to be better, to always do better, for everyone involved in each attempt. - its why it has strict rules (protocols) arranged, blind, recorded, feedback. I'm proud to call myself a remote viewer - I would not be so calling myself a Psychic - i see too much fraud in that field.

Simon Turnbull Well, Daz, if you're still interested in that story you asked me to write for Eight Martinis, describing how I beat eight professional stock market specialists using my brand of PRV (Predictive Remote Viewing) that was published in The Australian a few weeks ago, one of Australia's most respected newspapers, in my thirteenth year doing this, once beating the lot of them ... well, great ... I'll forgive all of the above diatribe ...

Daz Smith Simon Turnbull the above are my thoughts I am afraid based on alot of years of experience. The practice of remote viewing done within protocols IS the ONLY way for intuitive s to go if they ever want to be taken seriously - a psychic sitting across from a client telling them things that can be picked up by any number of normal natural human functions is not proof of intuition.

If you want to contribute to eight martinis then its up to you - it doesn't change my personal opinion. Every price of remote viewing i do for projects and clients I can assure them is 100% intuition (minus noise), its all done within the strict rules that attempt to rule out all others - i would hope that any serious person with ethical values would attempt to offer the same service.

Simon Turnbull Well, Daz Smith , it may come as a shock to you to hear that we are all intuitive ... there is no need to prove it ... it came with the packaging ... but, just like you, it's only IMO ...

Daz Smith Simon Turnbull - well that's not exactly true. Its not conclusive to all that psi exists, nor do we fully understand how it works. So to use it fully and as a 'credible' and 'ethical' service whereby people pay for it then yes I am afraid the responsibility falls on us to prove that what we sell actually exists and is true - if I pay for a psychic to give me 'intuition' - I want 'intuition' and not them reading my facial signatures.

I know we are all intuitive - but this is to greater and lesser degrees and if you sell a service then like everything in life you have to prove you can fulfill that service - this is where remote viewing differentiates itself - it can do this.

Daz Smith please bear in mind this isn't just about 'selling services' as humans we should all want to expand and verify/clarify our intuition and remote viewing allows this - i want to know how much of the information I give is pure psi and how much is noise or contamination - i want to do and be the best I can. remoet viewing, which is a few small rules allows this - fully.

Nathan Peters I'm starting to figure something out. Some people make a differentiation between RV and [X]RV. Psychic types seem to call what they do RV. Maybe to make it sound more scientific? Regardless of whether it is done blind or with any structure.

I've always considered RV to be structured and blind (though experienced viewers seem to be able to resist the effects of frontloading to some degree). Maybe this would be better termed as one of the [X]RVs out there.

At some point after the revelation of the government RV projects it seems many psychics just started calling what they did "Remote Viewing". Even if they didn't modify their protocol to include blinding and structure.

But to complicate matters, sometimes even early Remote Viewers didn't adhere to blinding. Nowadays it seems that structured RVers are learning the importance of being blind to the target for training and ops. This may be a new realization, born of years of practical experience that may not have been evenly distributed in the early days.

Nathan Peters P.S.: I'm tired of looking at Al's picture every time I look at this thread. Let's start a new one without a smug picture...

Angela Thompson Smith There used to be a Facebook feature where you could "hide" a post but this does not seem to be available here. I feel the same as Nathan.

Daz Smith Nathan Peters " Psychic types seem to call what they do RV. Maybe to make it sound more scientific? Regardless of whether it is done blind or with any structure."

exactly - in alot of cases you do find this - other than the protocols/rules ther really isnt much difference between it all.

Angela Thompson Smith I believe it was Tamra who asked, as a monderator, if she could unsubscribe Mr. Moch. I would like to do the same but this has been done before and usually someone else re-subscribes him.

Daz Smith too many admins im afraid - i believe joe allowed him back in but didn't ask to be admin or know what he was admining and has now been removed as admin (as he requested), I also asked Alexis to take me off the admin list.

Nathan Peters Just put up a poll. Be democratic about it Should the group make Mr. Moch "walk the plank". Yes or no.

Nathan Peters Sounds harsh but I think Al is abusing the easy-going, open nature of this particular group. Anywhere else: TKR, IRVA list, and especially RV community, he would have been kick-banned a long time ago.

Nathan Peters Daz: I think the multiplicity of admins is one of the things that makes this group (Alexis's creation) successful. There isn't a "clutch" of admins with a particular background. Turning it into a public version of the IRVA list (or anybody else's group) would be a loss, imo.

Simon Turnbull I'm beginning to see a strange attitude people such as Daz Smith and Nathan Peters exhibit when it comes to the psychic process ... Where does such arrogance come from? ... It certainly demonstrates very little understanding of what psychics do ... If they were not accurate in their readings, their clients would not return, it's as simple as that ... I doubt whether people such as these can possibly have any clients , as that attitude would only endear them to 'robopathic' personalities ... Seriously, who taught these people to have such a cock- eyed view of the psychic world ... How many think like this ... Surely not the majority ... They must be an embarrassment to somebody ... Who is responsible? ... I refuse to accept that that attitude is held by the majority of the RV community, because if that's true, things are much worse than I thought ...

Nathan Peters I'm not against people who refer to what they do as being "psychic", there is a bit of crossover with RVers on that anyway. But I've generally been unimpressed with the output of "psychics" and have been generally impressed with the output of structured RVers. It can go both ways.

I never went to psychics for anything (so I guess I don't really know how good they can get) but when I've inadvertently been pulled into their orbit what I've seen has been mostly cold-reading and targeted guesses. Not that they even know consciously that is what they are doing.

Maybe psychics do blind work. Give a Tarot reader a question in an envelope and have them do their thing before seeing the question? It would be an interesting experiment.

Paul H. Smith That does it! I'm starting a new thread with my response.

Jon Knowles As I'm sure all of us would agree, this is a remarkable thread. I've extracted and saved all of it, including all of the "See More"s. I'll either post it on my 120+ web site and/or maybe Palyne will post it on TKR.

Sandy Frost In response to Simon's comment. I began following RV in 1996 and began writing about it in 2001, I've never seen more bravado, closed mindedness or intolerance. So many are territorial, snarling that their way or their guru's way is the only way. The truth is that "the way" is different for each person. We all experience life differently. Where is the diversity in this community? Where are the efforts to be inclusive whether someone is a natural, a psychic. a clairvoyant, an intuitive or a rock who wants to learn CRV? How can we make RV more attractive when there is so much fighting, hate and criticism posted on places like this? So much potential, hope and promise lost to ego. After twelve years, same stuff. different day.

Daz Smith Simon where does my comments come from - that would be from being exposed to natural psychics in every shape and form from yhe age of 12 to where I am now at 42.

You are also still missing the point with the client psychic relationship - you claim accuracy - im saying its mainly body language when interaction is face to face. Because there are generally no measures or rules there is no way to be sure it was only psi in play.

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 autoscopy (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."

Simon Turnbull Whilst it's true what you say, James, some psychics are no more than glorified counsellors; and Daz is correct that (some) so-called psychics use cold-reading, that does not give people license to claim all psychics are fakes ... I have friends who are skeptics, and such palaver smacks of being in their company. ... I feel at times reading some posts like the time I debated James Randi (it's on YouTube) ... But I'm in a remote viewing page, for God 's sake ... luckily I'm thick-skinned, and have what I feel is an honourable agenda, or I would have been gone long ago ... It's interesting to read Sandy Frost and her feelings about her experience with certain people ... Bias and prejudice can be both constructive and destructive, depending on how you manage them, but if you want to get at the truth of something, you have to squeeze your way through the crap flying down the river ... Would you feel badly if I join Paul out on the front page? ...

James Vitale Hi Simon: joined Paul out on the front page?

Loraine Connon ... if he joined Paul out in the lime light!

James Vitale Ah, thank you, Loraine.

Daz Smith Simon Turnbull - i didn't say ALL psychic's are fakes - but until psychics work blind (proving psi) - then how will you EVER know if they are fake or not? Most psychics work within an environment where it cannot be determined if the data they give over is real (intuitive data).

As a remote viewer you are assured that every time I RV for you - its intuitive - without doubt.

********************************

THREAD AS OF c. 3:00 pm Thursday, February 07, 2013