

Roundtable: Psi Applications

Chairman: Jerry Solvvin

500 (490)

ARV (ASSOCIATIONAL REMOTE VIEWING) APPLICATIONS

Harold E. Puthoff (SRI International)

Given the challenge of applying remote viewing protocols to practical ends, we undertook a 30-trial series in which remote viewing was used to predict the daily outcomes of a commodities market variable (which was then successfully traded in the market). Of special interest are the differences in approaches/strategies employed in such a "bottom-line" application effort as compared with academic experimentation.

The technique employed is an ARV (associational remote viewing) procedure. In this method several remote viewers are asked to describe (free-response) a target object to be shown them at the close of the following day, the selection of that object to be determined by the following day's market activity (e.g., if market up, an apple; if down, a pencil). The task of the remote viewing judge is to determine from the viewers' transcripts the likely feedback object, and hence (in advance) the associated market movement. The sequence in detail is: (a) remote viewers generate transcripts; (b) without reference to the transcripts, two objects are selected and labeled (by use of a random number generator) market-up, market-down objects; (c) a judge determines a consensus vote as to which of the two objects is being described (and the associated market-movement prediction passed on to a trader); (d) at the close of the following market day the actual "ground-truth" market-movement object is shown the viewers for feedback, closing the loop.

Different from a standard research study, in an application effort such as this, the hypothesis structure consists of assuming that (a) every trial should work, and (b) a failed trial is to be attributed to "crossover" displacement, rather than the null hypothesis, with a remedial action in the form of a change in procedure called for. With this (non-standard) approach, failures early in the series led to continuing protocol changes as the series progressed. For example, under hypothesis (b) "leakage" paths were hypothesized, viz, precognitive view-

ing of object selection and/or judging, both of which initially involved intense interaction with each of the two objects under consideration. Protocol changes were instituted in the direction of eliminating all contact with the objects (with the corollary of judging from memory after having been shown the objects in situ). Although causation cannot be ascribed, an observed corollary to the procedural changes was an observed increasing performance level as the series progressed.

Seven naive percipients interested in raising funds for a charitable cause volunteered as remote viewers. Following an evening's instruction on the SRI remote viewing protocols, a series was begun. The number of remote viewing trials per person over the entire series ranged from a maximum of 36 (six pilot, 30 market trials) to a minimum of twelve. Individual hit rates were 10/12 (83.3%), 26/36 (72.2%), 19/28 (67.9%), 23/36 (63.9%), 18/30 (60.0%), 19/32 (59.4%), and 12/28 (42.9%), for a total of 127/202 (62.9%), an overall result significant at  $p < 1.6 \times 10^{-4}$ . Consensus judging yielded a somewhat increased market result of 21/30 (70.0%), significant at  $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-2}$ , and a series of profits/losses  $\approx$  \$1 - 2 K/ trial, netting  $>$  \$25 K profit for the entire series.

From a pedagogical viewpoint, the increased motivation for success in an application series of this type appears to provide an exceptionally rich matrix for hypothesis formation and protocol refinement, as well as providing a "bottom-line" statistic.