

THE POSSIBLE ROLE OF INTENTION, ATTENTION AND EXPECTATION IN REMOTE VIEWING

Joseph W. McMoneagle & Edwin C. May
Laboratories for Fundamental Research, Palo Alto

ABSTRACT

Joseph W. McMoneagle has participated in 44 on-camera demonstrations of remote viewing 35 of which would be considered as successful; that is, if they had been assessed by the usual blind rank-order method, they would have easily been ranked correctly in first place. The question we address here is, "What, if anything, is special about these cases?" Under US Government funding, the research track record of what is known as STARGATE was exceptional. Perhaps the success could be attributed to the near exclusive use of highly talented special participants. However, we speculate here that the ill-defined concepts of *intention*, *attention*, and *expectation* were/are major contributors to the success of application-oriented, laboratory, and media-centered trials. As an illustration of these points, we provide a detailed description of the protocol and results of a recent demonstration trial conducted for the National Geographic Channel that was carried out in LFR's remote viewing laboratory in Palo Alto, California. The producer and staff of Pioneer Productions dedicated one individual for four days just to prepare for the shoot. Her duties were to learn about what constitutes a good remote viewing target, identify 6 targets within 25 km from the laboratory, prepare two sets of target packs, identify a neutral 3rd party individual to secure these materials, and act as beacon person during the trial. The full team included a camera crew of three and a single producer. At the time of the trial all people present with the viewer were blind not only to the individual randomly selected target but also to the complete six-fold target pack. The response was blind rank-order assessed on-camera, and the correct target was matched as 1st place. The qualitative correspondence with the intended site was excellent and typical of the 35 of 44 other media trials provided by McMoneagle. This single trial serves as an exemplar of an ideal application of *intention*, *attention*, and *expectation*.

INTRODUCTION

We provide a qualitative and first-hand account from part of a research team that has worked together for 25 years. We will focus upon remote viewing trials that were conducted under the glare of various television cameras. The first of these was conducted by LMNO Productions in California. They approached us to be on a segment for a US National show called Put to the Test which aired on the ABC network in November 1995.

Since that time, Joseph W. McMoneagle has participated in 43 additional, real-time, on-camera remote viewing demonstrations with national level television production companies in six countries. About 35 of these were of such qualitative agreement with the intended site, that if they had been analyzed by the usual blind ranking technique commonly used within the laboratory, they would have easily been matched as a first place.

In a series of Japanese targets filmed in five presentations, now spanning a period of two years, the majority of these targets have been missing people wherein only the names and birthdates were known. In some of these cases, the place and where the person was last seen was known, and intensive searches for these people by police and private detective agencies met with little success over five to seven years. Only the name and birth date information was brought to the filming of the remote viewings which took place in the State of Virginia. All information relative to the missing people was placed within sealed envelopes and Joe was required to provide a complete description of the person, their age, location, and how to find them in Japan.

Joe was targeted only with what was contained in the sealed envelope; that is, something like, "This envelope contains what is known about a missing person in Japan. Please provide information about that

person and to the whereabouts of that person now.” The remote viewing information was then taken back to Japan and provided to a detective agency to be used to hunt for the missing people, with the results later televised. Joe did not receive any feedback prior to the actual show depicting the results of these searches shown in Japan, in some cases many months after the remote viewing session.

Five out of seven missing people were located using the remote viewing material alone. All portions of the search and the use of the remote viewing materials in the search were clearly documented and demonstrated on film in the formal program as feedback. In the case of people who have been found, they had been missing from 7 to 30+ years. In two of the cases, it was acknowledge on Nippon TV that both the police as well as professional detectives were unable to locate the missing persons Joe had been able to locate from his dining room in Virginia while targeting a sealed envelope using remote viewing.

Two additional missing children cases have been turned over to the police with solid leads because they are considered now to be criminal cases as a result of the information developed by remote viewing and will no longer be used for viewing or media purposes in Japan.

Joe has been challenged three times by highly skeptical panel members participating on the program during the live broadcast, usually by their announcing they have had their picture taken somewhere in Tokyo on the way to the studio and demanding Joe draw the location, which he has done accurately on all three occasions. In the most recent example, he also nearly named it as well - “I want to call this a Sports Arena, but that’s not what it actually is.” It was actually - “Sports Arena Auto.”

The latest US-based demonstration trial was for the National Geographic channel that was conducted in March 2004 to be aired sometime in the fall of 2004, and we will describe this example in detail

INTENTION, ATTENTION AND EXPECTATION

These terms, almost by definition, are imprecise. Rather than trying to formulate definitions in a remote viewing context, we will describe what often appears to be unique in public demonstrations of remote viewing and perhaps what was special during the 20-year, US Government program in remote viewing. We remind the reader that these ideas are qualitative and hope that they might inspire quantitative tests of the concepts.

There appears to be something special about conducting remote viewing demonstrations for the media. Certainly the psychosocial conditions, participants’ ego, and monetary incentive contribute to the general success. Here, however, we focus on attention, intention, and expectation.

Attention

Of the three concepts in this Section, *attention* is, perhaps, the easiest to discuss within the framework of successful demonstrations and laboratory remote viewing sessions. Part of *attention* is obvious and straight forward; during a trial, the participants should be focused upon the remote viewing task at hand and not be diverted with other simultaneous activity such as eating lunch. However, we suspect that *attention* may be a deeper concept than this.

Qualitatively, the 20+ year US Government program produced results that were consistently successful. If it were actually true quantitatively, then there may be a number of explanations. For example, we are told that observation theory might suggest that those successes arose because of the program’s secrecy.¹ However, in our view, other reasons are more likely. To illustrate we rarely used so-called un-selected participants, unlike many laboratories conducting psi research. Rather, we focused upon a few individuals who could reliably produce psi under laboratory conditions and worked with them, in some cases, for as long as 30 years. Perhaps this, alone, could account for the apparent success.

¹ Private communication from Dick Bierman.

Attention, however, is our candidate for a major component for the successes. We illustrate with a number of examples. When we were asked to conduct RV sessions against military or intelligence targets² in an application setting, the whole laboratory stopped all activity and focused on the job at hand. At the height of the program this meant that 12 people dropped what they were doing and devoted their efforts in providing the best environment in which to conduct the session. Often such a circumstance included flying one or more viewers to California from across the US. Clearly the *attention* was sharply focused. This same kind of *attention* was afforded to laboratory studies as well.

In contrast, we conducted a laboratory series of 75 trials that showed little evidence of RV (May, Spottiswoode, & Faith, 2000). What was different? This study had two experienced experimenters (one in Palo Alto and the other in Los Angeles) and five experienced viewers scattered all over the US. Rather than flying them all to LFR's remote viewing facility, we designed a complex, internet-based procedure, so for a given trial, each experimenter worked for about an hour and each viewer perhaps only 15 minutes in a telephone interview. Then all participants returned to their daily activity. Surely there may have been intense *attention* during the hour or so, but after the fact we all felt a substantial difference of the kind of *attention* from what was routine in the former government program. For example, a 15-minute scheduled telephone call to a viewer might have interrupted that viewer who was writing a paper, doing taxes, or having lunch. The internal, or perhaps, cognitive rationale, might have been, "Oh well, I'll finish what I was doing when I was interrupted when the session is over."

It is difficult and perhaps dangerously misleading to ascribe an apparent psi experiment failure to a qualitative post-hoc discussion like the one above; however, we feel it is important to try to open a dialog on what might be an important, but difficult topic—*attention*. The successful examples were selected from a very large dataset of similar circumstances, but so far we have only the one unsuccessful experiment that could be easily attributed to lack of *attention*.

If one would like to understand the difference between attention in remote viewing trials as expressed within the military project versus a more normal level of attention expressed in an experimental series, we recommend reading the dedication page of *The Stargate Chronicles*.³

Intention and Expectation

We include these two concepts in the same Section, because the differences are subtle but important. What we mean by *expectation* is what the whole team desires consciously (and perhaps unconsciously) for the outcome. Fear of psi, or lowered *expectation*, has been part of the lore⁴ and literature (Tart, 1984) for some time. If Tart is correct, while we might overtly *expect* a wildly successful trial, unconsciously we might be afraid of it and lower our *expectation* accordingly.

A laboratory anecdote might also illustrate *expectation*. A post doctoral student joined the US Government program late in its history. The other laboratory personnel had high *expectation* for success in whatever we tried based upon nearly two decades of experience. The new post doc was, understandably, skeptical of our success rates, especially when she/he was informed that we had an inverse file drawer problem; that is, we had a number of laboratory studies that were significant and not yet published.⁵ The new post doc's *expectation* for success was not as high as that of the other laboratory personnel.

It may seem obvious that high *expectation* is a necessary ingredient for success in any activity, let alone, remote viewing. If you expect to fall on the expert sky run, you probably will. It is not clear to us, however, the degree to which this might impact remote viewing. We have seen high quality remote viewing examples conducted before people who had high expectation of failure.

² Almost always in a blind or double-blind protocol.

³ *The Stargate Chronicles*, J.W. McMoneagle, Hampton Roads Publishing 2002.

⁴ Private communication as part of Ingo Swann's concept of experimenters' anti-psi syndrome.

⁵ That is still true today. LFR, as the keeper of the science record for the US Government Program has a substantial backlog of successful experiments to be published.

Intention while related to *expectation* may be different. We could, for example, gather a team together with the *intention* of winning the lottery but the *expectation* of winning might be rather low. *Intention* when mixed with *expectation* can be used to offer excuses for a potential failure. For example, the spectrum of the florescent lights is wrong; the experimenter did not show up on time; there is too much noise outside, etc. It is possible to overcome these “excuses” by adopting the proper attitude that these external things simply do not matter.

NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC CHANNEL REMOTE VIEWING TRIAL

What characterizes the 44 public demonstrations in which Joe has contributed is that financially and for reputation reasons the TV production crews and the viewer all had high intention, attention, and expectation. The public displays and filming were conducted more like the days of the US government program than what is done in many laboratory studies. Chuck Honorton first noticed this on-camera effect with the now well-known ganzfeld trial by Ellen Messer with Las Vegas as the target.⁶

We provide this example as an illustration of combined intention, attention, and expectation. This particular trial was conducted with the best and most secure protocol of any of the media trials so far. In this Section we describe that protocol, in detail, and graphically show the results.

Protocol

The participants for this trial were as follows:

- The show’s producer, MH.
- Assistant from the production company, RC.
- Assistant from a local law office, PS.
- Two camera men from Canada, CM1 & CM2
- Additional camera woman from the Bay Area, BA.
- Remote viewer, JM.
- Interviewer and judge, EM.

Thus, a total of eight individuals were actively involved in this single remote viewing. The trial was conducted in the office of the Laboratories for Fundamental Research in Palo Alto, California on Saturday, 21 February 2004. On the previous Thursday and prior to any other of the production crew coming to the Bay Area, RC came to the laboratory directly from London.

Target Preparation Instructions for RC

EM instructed RC on how to choose potential sites for the target, and RC was asked to find six locations within about 25 km from the laboratory and to select them to be as different from one another as possible. Each potential site was to be out of doors and contain elements that could be easily sketched. RC was asked to photograph each site from a number of perspectives and obtain a set of double prints for each.

RC prepared two sets of six opaque envelopes. Each set contained the individual photographs for each of the targets. To differentiate the sets, one was to be marked on a corner of each of the envelopes in the set.

When completed, both sets—one marked and one not—were to be delivered to PS no later than Friday at 17:00 hours. At no time was RC to have verbal or visual contact with any other person involved with the trial until the trial was complete. PS was asked to place one of the two sets aside, shuffle the remaining set; and then number that set from one to six on the outside of the unopened envelopes. At this point, no one knew what photographs were contained in any specific numbered envelope.

⁶ If we recall correctly, Chuck gathered together about eight similar cases with seven first place hits.

Trial Protocol

At 10:00 Saturday, JM and EM went to the laboratory to set up for the trial. Shortly after MH and CM1 & CM2 also appeared to set the lighting and camera for the 10:30 start time. MH instructed JM and EM on what to do for the camera. It is important to note that all people in the laboratory were blind to all the possible targets. They did know, however, that all sites were within 25 km of the laboratory.

At 09:30, RC went to PS's office, rolled a 6-sided die to choose one of the six target envelopes, and left with that unopened envelope. Once in the car, RC opened the envelope and drove to the specified target site in order to be there by 10:30.

At 10:30, EM showed JM a photograph of RC and tasked JM. "Have you seen the woman before?" (No was the answer.) "Please describe the location where she is currently standing." For the next 10 minutes JM wrote and drew his impression while on camera. EM asked for clarification and expansion on a number of points, but was silent for most of the session.

At the completion of the session, MH photocopied the response, gave the original to EM, and left the laboratory with JM, CM1 & CM2, and the camera gear. Once in their van, MH called RC to find where to take JM for feedback.

Meanwhile in the laboratory, EM was joined by BA and the laboratory door was closed. BA called PS on the phone and asked that he deliver through the mail slot in the door, the *second* set of six, unnumbered envelopes. Then, on camera, EM performed a rank-order assessment of which of the sets of photographs best matched the response, second best matched and so on for the remaining sets. The result of this ranking was written down for later.

While the blind ranking was in progress, JM, MH and CM1 & CM2 were all located at the intended site for feedback and totally out of communication with anyone back at the laboratory.

When JM, MH, RC and CM1 & CM2 returned to the laboratory, EM provided MH with the results of the blind ranking

Results

EM picked the correct target in first place. By definition the p-value for the single trial was $1/6 = 0.167$; however, as we will show below, rank order analysis is a conservative estimate of the information contained in a first-place match. It is beyond the scope of this paper to include the complete 6-page response, but we will include selected drawings and the following verbatim list in JM's final summary page:

- Unique access - tunnel like/passage access under an overpass.
- Building adjacent to what she's handling - work of art.
- Garden. Formal garden - fills a smaller area.
- Paths - both formal - straight lines & informal.
- Central work of art.
- Half arches.
- TGT stands alone - in a clearing w/trees.
- Smooth & rough/metal & stone.
- Large - looks upward at it.

Figure 1 shows one photograph from each of the potential targets.




Fig. 1 One Photograph from Each Potential Target Site

The numbers in the upper left corner of each photograph are the rank numbers assigned by EM. EM correctly assigned the end of the Dumbarton Bridge in first place. In order, the other sites were a rock quarry facility, the Palo Alto Municipal air port, the Redwood City marina, the Stanford University football stadium, and a redwood tree in a local park.

Figure 2 shows the correspondence with JM's first impression with regard to access to the site where RC was standing during the trial.



Fig. 2 Tunnel Underpass to the Site

RC was standing immediately on the right just through this tunnel. What was not too clear from the judging photograph (i.e., number 1 in Figure 1 above) was that precise location. RC was standing next to a plaque (i.e., work of art) directly beneath the massive concrete and metal of the ramp to the Dumbarton Bridge. During the session, RC was looking up at the structure, wandering around a “formal” garden and admiring the “work of art.” Figure 3 emphasizes these comparisons.




Fig. 3 Garden, Small Area, Work of Art and "High Overhang Overhead"

Unlike the photographs used in the blind rank-order analysis, the ones in Figures 2 & 3 were taken after the fact to correspond to the responses.

With regard to the summary list above, all points were correct with the possible exception of the half arches and a lack of trees and a building. EM experienced difficulty in the ranking between the first and second place using only the a priori photographs; however, if the ranking had been carried out as in the original SRI International protocol by visiting, in turn, each of the sites, there would have been no difficulty, whatsoever, in picking the correct target site in first place.

Finally we comment about rank-order in general. Imagine two extreme cases of remote viewing quality: (1) a near perfect description of the correct target, and (2) barely enough information to allow an analyst to match the response to the correct target. In the rank-order statistic both responses only receive a credit as a 1-in-N match— $N = 6$ in the example above. Clearly this approach, while conservative, ignores the additional information obtained in the viewing for the first case above. Additionally, using rank-order as a statistic while searching for correlations of remote viewing with other variables (e.g., LST, personality, GMF) may mislead or underestimate the correlation. We spent considerable effort over the last 20 years to develop other methods of analysis that were more sensitive to the information content (May et al., 2000; May, Utts, Humphrey, Luke, & Frivold, 1990).

DISCUSSION

What constitutes a psi-favorable environment is not well understood, but is, nonetheless important. There are a number of cases where it might be assumed that the circumstances would not be psi favorable (e.g., sea-sick viewer, demonstrations that had to be successful to obtain the next contract, next to 155 mm Army gun range, etc) but often high quality remote viewing was obtained even then. What is clear, at least

to those of us on our long-established team, is that intention, attention, and, expectation play a very important role in the success of both application and research of remote viewing

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the numerous networks and producers and crews whose intention, attention and expectation contributed to the successes of many of the demonstration remote viewings.

REFERENCES

- May, E. C., Spottiswoode, S. J. P., & Faith, L. V. (2000). Correlation of the gradient of Shannon entropy and anomalous cognition: Toward an AC sensory system. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 14(1), 53-72.
- May, E. C., Utts, J. M., Humphrey, B. S., Luke, W. L. W., & Frivold, T. J. (1990). Advances in remote-viewing analysis. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 54, 193-228.
- Tart, C. T. (1984). Acknowledging and dealing with the fear of psi. *Journal of the American Society for Psychological Research* 78(2), 133-143.

Address for correspondence: Edwin C. May, Laboratories for Fundamental Research, 415 Cambridge Ave., Suite 3, Palo Alto, California 94306, USA.
E-mail: may@lfr.org