

CAN REMOTE-VIEWING PENETRATE THE
UFO-ET ENIGMAS

Ingo Swann

A group of interested individuals met informally at Dr. Edith Jurka's on 26 June 1992 to discuss "paranormal" matters. I indicated that psychic research and ETs shared a common boundary in that all abductees say that the ETs communicate telepathically, while many other (but not all) accompanying phenomena are apparently psychic in nature.

I then spoke at some length on whether remote-viewing (a series of psychic processes) could be used to penetrate the psychic and other aspects of the UFO-ET enigmas. I also pointed out that conventional UFO-ET researchers have been reluctant to consider a psychic approach to the situations involved, and that many of them discount it entirely, even though the most common denominator between humans experiencing ET contacts or abductions is psychic in nature. The reasons for this avoidance are various, and some are substantial; but the avoidance on our part is a point of curious interest that has come to light in my thinking. Why do UFO-ET researchers erect a professional or disciplinary barrier between human and ET psychic activities?

Since I am not sure my comments at the informal gathering made all the sense I would have liked for them, I thought I would reprise and expand a little on certain of them herein.

First, it must be remembered that the term remote-viewing came into existence at the ASPR in New York in 1972 to describe a specific kind of experiment in which distance between subject and "target" was a notable factor. Remote-viewing does not refer to specific psychic abilities, although many subsequently assumed it did.

Second, remote-viewing as an activity performed by a "viewer" has been demonstrated (between 1973 and 1982) to consist of a series of subtle mind-dynamic processes whose origins in the viewer are pre-conscious as described, for example, by Dr. Norman Dixon in his monumental studies on subconscious, subliminal, and pre-conscious processes.

Third, remote-viewing sometimes manifests spontaneously in certain individuals and in such cases demonstrates an accuracy yield of the distant "target" of between 15-50 percent, but usually at the lower end. The most significant remote-viewing mind-dynamic processes, however, were understood by 1982,

resulting in specific training techniques which if acquired and precisely maintained can increase the accuracy yield to between 65-95 percent.

Fourth, and very importantly, the accuracy yield, however, can only be confirmed if adequate feed-back regarding the "target" is possible. Since this feed-back is probably not going to be quickly possible regarding the UFO-ET situations, the use of remote-viewing (RV) processes to assess those situations will fall for an indefinite time into the realms of psychic speculating. It is for this reason that I personally have not undertaken to apply remote-viewing processes to those situations since any RV results would fall into the realm of speculation at least from the viewpoints of potential users of the RV-acquired information.

Fifth, RV of the UFO-ET situations presents novel problems which differ considerably from, for example, using RV to ascertain characteristics of geophysical Earth sites -- and a consideration of the most notable of these novel situations comprises the remainder of this brief document.

Generally speaking, what a remote-viewer "sees" must fall within the viewer's experiential realities in order to be "recognized" and engage the viewer's analytical processes of reason and logic in order to be "interpreted". Anything "seen" which does not correspond with these two important perceptual factors will not, as trained remote-viewers know, be "decoded" very well, if at all. The basis for this difficulty is well recognized in conventional perceptual research. If a person sees something they have never seen before, they will not know what it is. Even trained remote-viewers are not excused from this difficulty, although they are trained to identify its presence.

When someone sees something they have never seen before, they cannot recognize it for what it is because what it is falls outside of their recognition-interpretation boundaries. But, in such cases, secondary analytical interpretation mechanisms usually go to work by providing comparisons of what is not known to what is known. Indeed, all of us interpret what we encounter through what we know -- which leads to the well-known phenomena of people interpreting what they encounter through their beliefs, realities, and expectations. Perceived information which fits our realities is accepted, even if it is only secondary interpretation; what does not fit is rejected, with the added difficulty that what does not fit is often not "seen" in the first place.

In this way, a curious reversal takes place. We assess what we perceive by what we have already experientially preceived-assessed in the past. When we encounter phenomena (such as UFO-ETs), we are likely to interpret those phenomena not as they are

in themselves, but by projecting our secondary understanding onto them -- and then making the mistake of assuming our secondary understanding is correct. Conventional UFO-ET research is rife with this, and many researchers tend to interpret UFO-ET "evidence" to suit their given understandings and acquired realities.

This same situation will plague RV attempts to penetrate the UFO-ET enigmas, which are enigmas because few if any of them appear to correspond to, as I will call them, Earth-based secondary understandings and realities which are being widely used interpret and understand UFO-ET stuff by professional researchers and lay observers alike. The real realities, so to speak, of UFO-ETs lie with them, and we on Earth have not erected a data bank which identically can correspond with their realities. Thus, we interpret their realities through our own, identifying their realities within the scope of our Earth-bound understandings regarding our understanding levels of science, astrophysics, technology, politics, psychology, cultural, religious, philosophical, and sociological orientations. In remote-viewing parlance (which is developing its own vocabulary), all this is called front-loading.

Frontloading is a significant problem with regard to gaining understanding both of psychic capabilities and UFO-ET situations. Any meaningful attempt to penetrate UFO-ET realities by RV must be preceded by discovering ways and means to transcend this significant Earth-bound problem -- and how this is to be accomplished is not at all clear, at least to me.

Beyond this significant situation, I fully expect that the UFO-ET "hardware" can be perceived and rendered visible in draw or modeled forms by qualified remote-viewers -- some of which have already been done. However, it is not at all certain whether UFO-ET hardware is always hardware as we might interpret such on Earth, since UFO-ETs apparently disobey all the physical laws we normally attribute to hardware. A piece of hardware that vanishes is not exactly "hard" in doing so. Thus, the use of phrase "UFO-ET hardware" has implications which fall outside of our Earth-bound interpretations, and will do so even for the remote-viewer. So the matter of escaping Earth-based understandings is not straight-forward even from that aspect.

Although others may with justification adopt other approaches to the RV aspect, from my point of view it would appear that psychic information about UFO-ETs needs to be impartially collected over time without subjecting it to analysis -- all of which would probably be founded in some kind of Earth-bound understanding. Eventually, as the collection grows, it might itself suggest some correlations or consistencies internal to it. I would suspect that if these correlations or consistencies are experienced as alien to our understanding,

is quite likely they might represent pertinent clues. Thus, as stated at the informal meeting, I have decided to begin accumulating this kind of information if possible, and will delay subjecting it to analyses for some time.

Lastly, as mentioned at the meeting, we tend to interpret UFO-ETs as whos or things or whats. What or who are they, or what are their crafts made of, how are they propelled, what are they doing here? Etc. Answers to all these call for judgements and conclusions, and our conclusions can only come as a result of our Earth-bound experiential consistencies. As I discussed, everything which is can only be what it is as the result of processes which make it what it is. I don't believe UFO-ETs are excused from processes which result in their being whatever they are.

Yet, so far as I can tell, UFO-ETs have always been looked at as things, etc. -- not as process. Processes both precede and make things what they become. Remote-viewers need to start with something to focus on, and naturally usually select things or whos as foci-stimuli -- which does work ... sometimes. In any event, I propose to focus on UFO-ETs as things and process, indicating the differences between them. When the RV-accumulated data pool is large enough and internal self-consistencies within the data become apparent (if they do), I will be glad to circulate it to those who attended the meeting if they are interested.

Ingo Swann
27 June 1992