

RV RESEARCH

REMOTE VIEWING THE OUTCOME OF THE 2012 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

by Debra Lynne Katz

An expedition into the unexplored territory of remote viewing and rating human subjects as targets within a binary protocol.

Introduction

In early October 2012, Michelle Bulgatz and Debra Lynne Katz designed a project to determine whether remote viewers could accurately predict the outcome of the then-upcoming presidential election on November 5, 2012. With the primaries completed, the two candidates in the general election would be the incumbent, Barack Obama, and Republican challenger Mitt Romney. Polls indicated that it would be a very close race.

This experiment set out with the following questions:

1. Can remote viewers from a variety of backgrounds, even with little experience viewing human targets, predict the outcome of a presidential election when utilizing a double-blind protocol.
2. How does a project involving a human target differ from those utilizing objects and locations?
3. Is the use of human targets in remote-viewing-related research projects or applied-precognition projects involving binary outcomes, something that researchers or project managers may want to consider in the future?
4. Which method/system of rating/judging sessions is most helpful when evaluating sessions with human

subjects as targets?

5. How strongly will a viewer's candidate preference affect their session?

While this modest study was not intended to produce a huge data set (and therefore statistical significance cannot be calculated), its value lies in the knowledge gained and lessons learned about remote viewing and the rating of human targets within a binary blind protocol; this has the potential to be useful

to those designing and implementing their own remote-viewing projects in the future.



Barack Obama (l) and Mitt Romney (r) (Image: Associated Press)

Background and Participant Selection

Remote viewers utilize intuitive yet structured protocols to obtain information that lies outside their analytic mind or current knowledge base; that information comes to them in the form of images, words, sounds, smells, physical sensa-

tions, and emotions.

Several viewers participating in this project were trained and experienced in a variety of methods such as Controlled Remote Viewing (CRV) and Extended Remote Viewing (ERV), methods originally developed for and utilized by researchers and remote viewers serving in various secret U.S. military and government programs. Some viewers were also trained in clairvoyant-reading methods described in two of this writer's books, "You are Psychic: The Art of Clairvoyant Reading & Healing" and "Extraordinary Psychic: Proven Techniques to Master Your Natural Abilities."

A couple of the viewers were new to both methods, having only done one or two remote-viewing sessions prior to this study.

Why Choose a Human Target?

Unlike other intuition-related disciplines, human subjects are the least utilized targets in remote-viewing practice and applied-precognition projects. Although some viewers participating in this project have done hundreds of sessions, most of those trained in CRV or ERV have little experience with viewing human targets directly. This is not to say these viewers have not had experience describing humans; on the contrary, when one is tasked with viewing a location or activity at a location, humans are often present whom the viewer will successfully describe. However, most of the time, the main tasking is to describe a location or object, or activity the human is engaged in, as opposed to the more personal aspects of that human. In most remote-viewing practice sessions, given that the surrounding environment is the focus, the human is often explored by the viewer more as a means to an end rather than the end itself, i.e., the human's emotions, actions, clothing, demeanor, and words can shed light on what is going on around him or her.

In contrast, those trained in clairvoyant-reading methods primarily do "read" people rather than locations or objects, although there is some crossover as people are impacted by or are curious about their locations.

Project Methodology

In mid-September 2012, eleven viewers responded to a request to participate in this project. The viewers ranged from having over 10 years' experience and hundreds of remote-viewing sessions to a fairly new clairvoyant student having only a few sessions completed. Most of the eleven viewers had little experience with human targets.

An e-mail was sent out to the viewers with only a randomly generated target number that had no significance to the target, as follows: "The target number is 91752183. Describe the target." The viewers were not told this was a human target. Still, the first three viewers' sessions only described locations and made no mention of people whatsoever. Whereupon, the

researcher team revised their tasking after consulting with experts in the remote-viewing community.

Lyn Buchanan, a recognized teacher of CRV, advised that it would be acceptable to provide tasking of "the target is a person; describe the person," explaining that, while traditional psychic research calls for both viewers and those assigning them targets to remain completely blind to the target, in operational projects viewers are often given taskings that narrow down what needs to be focused on in their sessions.

Such tasking does not significantly diminish how blind the viewers are to the target, given the number of people in the world alive now, and throughout history, and those who exist as no more than a concept (e.g., Superman, Harry Potter, etc.), even though some researchers who have not run operational projects might find this approach less valid. However, an examination of a variety of studies of high scientific validity from other disciplines indicates that the "blindness" traditionally required in remote-viewing research projects far exceeds the level mandated in other fields, even on projects where people's lives are dependent on the findings.

In light of the above, the same target number was sent to the eleven viewers, but with the changed tasking of "the target is a person; describe the person." Three viewers who had earlier provided sessions containing no information about a human subject were asked to repeat their sessions, disregarding whatever information had emerged during their first attempt.

Session Evaluation & Scoring

The viewers' sessions were evaluated and scored using an analytical method recently developed by Alexis Poquiz for use in Associative Remote Viewing (ARV) projects; his goal was to automate a modified interpretation of the 0 - 7 Point Rating Scale for Target Transcript Correspondences, in an attempt to generate more consistent judging scores.

Applying the 0-7 point rating scale has been challenging because the different scale levels are not precisely defined. Instead, they are stated using broad and subjective terms, e.g., a Level 3 confidence ranking is defined as a "mixture of correct and incorrect elements, but enough of the former to indicate that the viewer has made contact with the target,"

whereas a Level 4 confidence ranking has “good correspondence with several matchable elements intermixed with some incorrect information.” Such similarity in definitions has led to wildly differing judging scores between multiple viewers.

Because a preliminary review of the eleven viewers’ sessions showed few sketches and many descriptors that needed careful analyzing, it was decided that the 0-7 point rating scale would not be sensitive enough and that Poquiz’s more sensitive judging tool (which scores every individual word and sketch as either a “hit”, a “miss”, or “undetermined”) would be better and should be used alone.

Challenges to Viewing and Judging this Human RV Target

Both judges began this project with the naive assumption that the two candidates were quite different: One candidate was African-American, an incumbent, and a Democrat with strong liberal ideals, while the other was Caucasian, a very wealthy conservative Republican from a devout Mormon background. However, many of the descriptors in each session applied to both men:

- male
- middle-aged
- expensive house
- wears suits to work
- public figure
- accomplished speaker
- fixated on money
- has a staff
- seems suburban
- residential area
- fit
- smartly dressed
- muscular
- tall
- dark hair
- contemplative
- health good
- girly-like hands
- approaches work like duty
- people pay attention to him
- hair is short

- enjoys reading
- enjoys learning
- went to expensive schools
- is smart
- sometimes feels lonely and sad
- father
- on hot seat, like in court
- being grilled by a panel or like on a panel

Some descriptors, such as those pertaining to race/coloring/religion, were also not easy to assign given that Obama’s mother was Caucasian and he is lighter-complected than many people of African-American descent:

- appears Caucasian-like
- golden-tan person
- light skin
- wavy hair
- the thought, Jesus Christ popped in my head.

For words and phrases over which the judges had prolonged debate and discussion, a “Q” was assigned and they were placed in the Question/Unknown category.

On some words and phrases recorded, the judges had differing opinions based on the TV networks they had watched:

- gives money away
- generous
- caring
- loving
- kind
- appears to be a thinker

Problematic words that could be relative to the viewers’ perception of themselves included:

- short
- tall
- thin
- large
- old
- young

- muscular

Determining the accuracy of factual information also became a source of contention in the judging, such as:

- has 7 brothers
- they all do similar work

Other descriptors simply could not be verified either way:

- perspires a lot
- sometimes feels lonely or sad
- sometimes wears a tennis band on head
- man teaching girl to tap dance
- lives west of a museum ("Y" for Obama, "Q" for Romney)

Out of eleven viewing sessions, only three con-



ing the nature of the target, the viewer felt at first that it resembled Romney, but then changed his mind! It was ultimately judged as Unknown.

This last viewer's session also focused in minute detail on every aspect of the target's physical health and makeup, more so than any other viewer; unfortunately, many of these details also fell into the Unknown category.

Analysis

Once session scoring had been completed, two spreadsheets were created for each viewer that included the list of descriptors and sketches along with the ratings given by the judges when they were compared to each candidate. Percentages were calculated for those that matched ("Correct %"), did not match ("Wrong %"), and that were Unknown ("Q %") for both candidates; these were listed in two tables showing which viewer's session pointed to which candidate.

See Tables 1A and 1B.



Sketch by Viewer 7 - Session pointed to Romney, but there was a high number of "Q"s.

tained a sketch of a face. One was not detailed enough to show a resemblance to either candidate; another detailed set of sketches resembled a religious figure. Given that Romney had been a bishop for several years, this was scored as a "yes" for him. The final sketch, at first glance, appeared to both judges to be a close match to Obama; however, upon learn-

TABLE 1A - Calculation of scores for all viewers' sessions compared to what could be known of presidential candidate Mitt Romney by the judges.

(See table on next page.)

Target Romney	Remote Viewer	Y	N	Q	Correct %	Wrong %	Q %
Romney	Viewer 01	11	4	9	73%	27%	38%
Romney	Viewer 02	3	10	4	23%	77%	24%
Romney	Viewer 03	17	0	0	100%	0%	0%
Romney	Viewer 04	4	4	1	50%	50%	11%
Romney	Viewer 05	20	10	12	67%	33%	29%
Romney	Viewer 06	6	2	3	75%	25%	27%
Romney	Viewer 07	16	9	28	64%	36%	53%
Romney	Viewer 08	8	11	14	42%	58%	42%
Romney	Viewer 09	7	6	5	54%	46%	28%
Romney	Viewer 10	48	9	19	84%	16%	25%
Romney	Viewer 11	5	16	2	24%	76%	9%
Romney Averages	Group	13.18	7.27	8.82	60%	40%	26%

TABLE 1B - Calculation of scores for all viewers' sessions compared to what could be known of presidential candidate Barack Obama by the judges.

Target Obama	Remote Viewer	Y	N	Q	Correct %	Wrong %	Q %
Obama	Viewer 01	9	7	8	56%	44%	33%
Obama	Viewer 02	11	3	3	79%	21%	18%
Obama	Viewer 03	1	1	0	50%	50%	0%
Obama	Viewer 04	6	2	1	75%	25%	11%
Obama	Viewer 05	25	5	12	83%	17%	29%
Obama	Viewer 06	7	2	2	78%	22%	18%
Obama	Viewer 07	8	13	32	38%	62%	60%
Obama	Viewer 08	11	11	11	50%	50%	33%
Obama	Viewer 09	10	4	4	71%	29%	22%
Obama	Viewer 10	48	8	19	86%	14%	25%
Obama	Viewer 11	8	14	1	36%	64%	4%
Obama Averages	Group	13.09	6.36	8.45	64%	36%	23%

Results: A Prediction Made

Table 2 shows the predictions from each viewer. Note the "Lower Q%" column that shows which target has a lower percentage of unknowns. The assumption was: the fewer unknowns for a particular target, the more indicative that the session is leaning towards that target.

From the first column in Table 2, it can be seen that out of eleven viewers, eight had a stronger match for Obama, with three matches for Romney. The "Lower Q%" score yielded an overall group prediction for Obama, changing one vote from Romney to Obama, changing another vote from Romney to a tie, and changing three of the votes from Obama to a tie, with one vote for Romney remaining the same.

TABLE 2 - Viewer Predictions Based On Higher Correct Percentage and Lower Q% Scores.

PREDICTIONS	Higher Correct %	Lower Q%
Viewer 1	Romney	Obama
Viewer 2	Obama	Obama
Viewer 3	Romney	Tie
Viewer 4	Obama	Tie
Viewer 5	Obama	Tie
Viewer 6	Obama	Obama
Viewer 7	Romney	Romney
Viewer 8	Obama	Obama
Viewer 9	Obama	Obama
Viewer 10	Obama	Tie
Viewer 11	Obama	Obama

Viewer Preference Comparison

Only after the election were all viewers informed, via e-mail, that they had been tasked with viewing the candidate who was elected in November 2012, Barack Obama.

One factor this project wanted to consider was whether a viewer's preference for a particular candidate may have had correlation with their session. One week after being given feedback, the viewers were surveyed for their preference between Obama and Romney, which one they voted for or which one they had preferred to win. Even if there were total correspondence here, it would not serve to prove that viewers' unconscious preferences had played a role; rather, it would only suggest the likelihood of this more so than if there were little correspondence.

Table 3 shows the viewers' preferences compared to their adjudged predictions. From this table, seven out of eleven viewers indicated a preference towards one candidate, even though some of these did not vote, for a variety of reasons. Two viewers did not respond to repeated inquiries regarding their preference, and two others indicated they had no preference.

Out of the seven who did respond, all voiced a preference for the candidate to whom their session pointed! While it cannot be stated with certainty that their preference did have a retrocausal impact on their session, this possibility has to be given consideration in the same way that the possibility of telepathic influence is traditionally considered and controlled for in most parapsychology research. Even if this experiment's data set had been large enough to determine

statistical significance, it still could not be said with any certainty that the viewers were strictly viewing the winning candidate, as they may have been simply viewing their retrocausal preferences -- which, in six of seven cases noted here, just so happened to turn out to be the winning candidate. Future research might explore the potential problem of subconscious viewer preference within a binary protocol and in projects involving the prediction of future outcomes.

TABLE 3 - Viewer Preference and Prediction Comparisons.

VIEWER	CANDIDATE PREFERENCE (Self-reported)	SESSION PREDICTION (Higher Correct %)	Lower Q %
Viewer 01	None	Romney	Obama
Viewer 02	Obama	Obama	Obama
Viewer 03	Romney	Romney	Tie
Viewer 04	Obama	Obama	Tie
Viewer 05	Obama	Obama	Tie
Viewer 06	Unknown	Obama	Obama
Viewer 07	None	Romney	Romney
Viewer 08	Obama	Obama	Obama
Viewer 09	Obama	Obama	Obama
Viewer 10	Obama	Obama	Tie
Viewer 11	Unknown	Obama	Obama

Conclusions

1. *Will remote viewers be able to predict the outcome of the next presidential election when utilizing a double-blind protocol?* Yes!

2. *How will a project involving a human target differ from those utilizing objects and locations?* Human targets offer a number of challenges for judges, as there are aspects of people that cannot be known or verified, or are subjective, conceptual, or paradoxical. Both viewers and judges tend to evaluate humans in relation to themselves. When a viewer says a man is "tall" or "active and energetic," judges do not necessarily know what the viewer means by "tall" or "active/energetic."

3. *Is the use of human targets in remote-viewing-related research projects or applied-precognition projects involving binary outcomes, something that researchers or project managers may want to consider in the future?* From this experiment's out-

come, human subjects should not be in both target options in a binary protocol, if possible, as they are too orthogonally similar. Rating humans as targets is time-consuming and prone to subjective decision-making; there are just too many aspects of a human that a remote viewer may access but which cannot be verified.

4. *Which method/system of rating/judging sessions is most helpful when evaluating sessions with human subjects as targets?* The CRS could not be easily applied to this experiment's sessions to produce a prediction, whereas the Poquiz system could. While this relatively new system is a superior tool for a project such as this, it is both more laborious and time-intensive. It filters sessions down to single perceptions or very simple phrases, which means context can be lost in the process. Sessions should therefore be on hand for review, even when all descriptors have been entered onto spreadsheets.

5. *How strongly will a viewer's candidate preference affect their session?* As a majority of viewers (six of eleven) indicated a preference for Obama, and one of the viewers whose sessions pointed to a description of Romney also voiced a strong preference for Romney, the possibility that participants remote viewed their own preferences rather than the desired target should not be ruled out.

Project Remote Viewers

Michelle Beltran, Jon Noble, Deborah Sherif, Laura Shelton, Paul Hennessy, Patsy Posey, Dolphin, David Beatty, Dan Hoffcaker, Jason Brown, Russ Evans.

Debra Lynne Katz operates the *International School of Clairvoyance*. She is author of *You Are Psychic: The Art of Clairvoyant Reading & Healing* (Llewellyn Worldwide, 2004); *Extraordinary Psychic: Proven Techniques to Master Your Natural Abilities* (Llewellyn, 2008); and *Freeing the Genie Within* (Llewellyn 2009). She is one of the recipients of the 2012 IRVA/IRIS Warcollier research award. She has studied and practiced remote viewing for several years. Her website is www.debra Katz.com.

