

Concept Paper

Not peer-reviewed version

A Testable Source–Receiver Model for Remote Viewing

[Julian G. B. Northey](#)*

Posted Date: 27 May 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202605.1880.v1

Keywords: remote viewing; anomalous cognition; entropy gradient; radical pairs; chirality; template resonance; holographic targets; torsion; source–receiver model



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC, OpenAlex.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Concept Paper

A Testable Source–Receiver Model for Remote Viewing

Julian G. B. Northey

Frontier Agri-Science Inc., Canada; julian.northey@protonmail.com

Abstract

Remote viewing, also called anomalous cognition in much of the laboratory literature, has generated a substantial but controversial body of free-response experiments, operational reports, and theoretical interpretations. Yet the field still lacks a viable source–receiver mechanism that can explain how target-correlated information could arise, how it could be transduced by the body, and why successful reports often appear as fragments, sketches, shapes, textures, gestalts, and nonanalytic impressions rather than as literal transmitted pictures. This paper proposes a conditional source–receiver hypothesis. The target is modeled not as a semantic transmitter but as a structured physical system whose geometry, entropy gradients, chirality, motion, temporal modulation, and boundary conditions may shape a weak source-correlated perturbation. The receiver is modeled as an active biological system in which weak spin-dependent or connection-like perturbations could bias phase-sensitive biochemical processes, especially radical-pair singlet–triplet dynamics in chiral hydrated molecular environments. Redox feedback, chromatin and hydration dynamics, and larger body/brain state variables could then amplify microscopic phase biases into changes of embodied state. Conscious report is treated as a template-resonance output: the receiver reconstructs weak state shifts through learned geometric, somatic, symbolic, and perceptual templates. The framework is not offered as proof of remote viewing, nor as a claim that torsion or any particular exotic field has been established. Rather, it is a testable architecture that motivates three experimental paradigms to try and bring a clearer picture: Fourier-holographic target tests, geometric-masker tests, and dot/dash numerical-carrier tests. It also motivates retrospective corpus analyses of archived remote-viewing sessions for entropy direction, local ordering, drawing morphology, and geometric primitives that were not always emphasized in earlier scoring systems.

Keywords: remote viewing; anomalous cognition; entropy gradient; radical pairs; chirality; template resonance; holographic targets; torsion; source–receiver model

A Testable Source–Receiver Model for Remote Viewing

Introduction: The Missing Mechanism Problem

Remote viewing is usually defined as a free-response procedure in which a participant attempts to describe or sketch a target that is hidden from ordinary sensory access. The target may be a distant location, a photograph, an object, an event, or in some protocols a future-selected target. The literature is controversial, and strong claims about remote viewing remain disputed. Nevertheless, several recurring features of the literature are sufficiently patterned to justify a mechanism-focused hypothesis paper. The problem is not simply whether individual trials can be judged as hits or misses. The deeper problem is that the field still lacks a source–receiver model precise enough to be wrong.

The usual explanations proposed in informal discussions are too coarse. Saying that a viewer ‘sees’ a distant target does not explain what physical variable leaves the target, what kind of carrier or correlation is involved, how the body could detect it, or why the final report is usually fragmentary and nonanalytic. Conversely, dismissing the phenomenon because it lacks a mechanism does not address the actual structure of the reported data. A useful hypothesis should begin by asking what

kind of mechanism would be required if even a weak portion of the remote-viewing literature were valid.

This paper proposes such a mechanism in conditional form. It does not claim that remote viewing has been proven. It does not claim that a picture is transmitted into the brain. It does not claim that minimal Einstein–Cartan torsion, by itself, can explain remote perception. Instead, it asks whether the following source-to-report architecture is coherent and experimentally useful: target structure → weak source-correlated perturbation → biological phase bias → global embodied state shift → template resonance → verbal or graphical report.

The model is intentionally layered. The source layer asks how target geometry, entropy gradients, chirality, temporal modulation, and boundary conditions might generate or modulate a weak physical signature. The receiver layer asks how the body could transduce a weak spin-dependent or connection-like perturbation into chemistry and physiology. The cognitive layer asks why the result would appear as sketches, shapes, symbols, somatic impressions, or gestalts rather than as a high-resolution image. Each layer is separately testable.

Phenomenological Clues from the Remote-Viewing Literature

The first clue is that remote viewing is usually a free-response task, not a forced-choice guessing task. Targ (2019) emphasizes that remote viewing is nonanalytic: describing a distant shape, form, or location is easier than guessing a number or card. Early SRI reports framed remote viewing as a free-response perceptual-channel protocol under sensory shielding (Targ & Puthoff, 1974; Puthoff & Targ, 1976). In the SRI literature, viewers are encouraged to report impressions, sketches, and simple forms before prematurely naming the target. Drawings often carry information that is not captured in verbal labels. This matters because a mechanism built around transmitted semantic labels would predict the opposite pattern. If names, numbers, and analytic categories are often difficult, the accessible target variables may be more geometric, spatial, dynamic, and sensory-like than linguistic.

A second clue is that drawings are not incidental. In the historical SRI and Star Gate material, sketches repeatedly appear as essential outputs. Targ (2019) describes Ingo Swann's emphasis on small sketches or glyphs as early links with the target image. The operational literature also reports that viewers were asked to draw perceptions after sessions and that drawings could sometimes be more informative or accurate than verbal descriptions. A source–receiver model should therefore explain why reportable information is often expressed motorically and geometrically.

A third clue comes from May and colleagues' entropy-gradient work. May, Spottiswoode, and Faith (2000) reported that anomalous-cognition quality correlated with the gradient of Shannon entropy of the associated target, while the correlation with total entropy was much weaker. Their interpretation was explicitly sensory-like: ordinary sensory systems tend to respond to change, contrast, or gradients rather than absolute levels. For the present model, this suggests that a target may become more legible when it contains transitions, contrasts, boundary formation, energetic change, or structured differences across space and time.

A fourth clue is state dependence. The IEEE symposium volume *Mind at Large* frames psi research as low signal-to-noise, physiologically and psychologically sensitive, and difficult to reduce to a simple message-transfer process (Tart et al., 2002). Tart's discussion of trans-temporal inhibition, May and colleagues' EEG-correlate work, and Swann's emphasis on subjective factors all point to a receiver that is not passive. May and Marwaha's multiphasic model similarly separates physics-domain questions from neuroscience and receiver-domain questions (May & Marwaha, 2015). Attention, expectation, confidence, arousal, feedback, and experimental relationship may alter the receiver's susceptibility. In the present model, this is treated as a body-state susceptibility, not merely as psychological noise.

These clues motivate a simple requirement: a viable theory should account for low bandwidth, geometry, entropy gradients, bodily state, and reconstructive reporting. It should not begin by assuming that remote viewing is analogous to ordinary seeing.

Table 1. Phenomenological constraints and model implications.

Observation in the literature	Implication for a source–receiver model
Reports are often sketch-like, spatial, and nonanalytic	The report stage may involve geometric and somatic templates rather than semantic decoding.
Natural scenes and forms are often more suitable than arbitrary symbols or numbers	Accessible variables may include shape, contrast, texture, boundary, motion, and entropy gradient.
Drawings may preserve information missed by verbal labels	Motor-visual reconstruction should be treated as a primary output, not a secondary illustration.
Entropy-gradient correlations have been reported	Target legibility may depend on changes, gradients, ordering/disordering, and local structure.
Results appear state-dependent and noisy	Receiver susceptibility should be modeled as an active body/brain variable.
Precognitive protocols appear in the literature	A purely retarded-field model may be incomplete and requires temporal-boundary caveats.

The Source Is a Structured Physical System, Not a Message Sender

The first step is to stop treating the target as a semantic transmitter. A bridge does not transmit the word bridge. A photograph of a mountain does not transmit a mental picture in ordinary language. A target is a physical system with geometry, material composition, illumination, boundaries, motion, entropy gradients, chirality, thermal fluctuations, and temporal history. If remote-viewing-like effects are real, target-specificity may arise because such physical properties shape a weak source or scattering signature.

This distinction is essential. A target can be represented as a physical source functional rather than a message. In prose, the source chain is: target geometry and dynamics shape a physical source or scattering current; that current produces a weak source-correlated perturbation; the perturbation reaches the receiver; the receiver's body converts it into a state bias. The model does not assume that the perturbation carries full semantic content. It carries amplitude, phase, frequency, chirality, temporal modulation, entropy-gradient structure, or low-dimensional spatial relationships.

A static target presents a special problem. A static shape does not normally radiate simply because it has shape. Therefore, the model distinguishes emission from scattering. Dynamic targets may generate source structure through motion, metabolism, rotation, heating, cooling, phase transition, turbulence, electrical switching, biological activity, or entropy flow. Static targets may instead act as structured scatterers of a background or ambient field. The experiment should not assume the answer. It should compare static, dynamic, entropic, chiral, and geometrically structured targets.

Entropy Gradients and Local Ordering

Entropy should be treated carefully. In thermodynamics, the entropy of a closed system does not decrease. But local subsystems can become more ordered by exporting entropy to the environment. A crystallizing solution, a condensing vapor, a forming surface, a cooling object, an assembly process, or a growing biological structure can represent local ordering while the total

environment remains consistent with the second law. This distinction may matter for remote-viewing research. Earlier entropy-gradient work emphasized the magnitude of target change or information gradient. The present model adds a further question: do local ordering processes differ phenomenologically from disordering processes?

The answer is not known. But the question is testable. Archived sessions and new experiments can code target processes as local ordering, local disordering, neutral/static, or mixed. Local ordering might be unusually legible if it produces coherent boundary formation, phase alignment, crystallinity, containment, or emergent geometry. Local disordering might be legible through heat, dispersal, combustion, fragmentation, turbulence, or energetic release. The model predicts that both gradient magnitude and gradient sign may be worth analyzing.

Receiver-Side Transduction: The Body as an Active Phase-Sensitive Medium

A weak source-correlated perturbation would be far too small to create perception directly. The receiver cannot be a passive screen. The body must be an active amplifier and interpreter. Living tissue is a nonequilibrium medium containing hydrated chiral molecules, radical-pair reactions, spin-dependent electron-transfer pathways, redox feedback, chromatin dynamics, mitochondrial rhythms, membrane excitability, neural oscillations, and predictive cognitive networks. A weak perturbation could matter only if it enters a gain chain.

The proposed receiver chain is: weak perturbation → differential molecular phase bias → radical-pair or spin-chemical yield shift → redox and hydration response → chromatin or cellular-state modulation → body/brain order-parameter shift → template resonance. This chain is intentionally conservative in one respect: the external input is a seed/signal, not a message. Most of the energy and interpretation come from the organism.

Radical Pairs as Biological Phase Interferometers

Radical pairs provide a concrete biological foothold because they are already known to be spin-sensitive in magnetoreception models (Ritz et al., 2000; Hore & Mouritsen, 2016). A radical pair can exist in coherent singlet and triplet spin states. Its chemistry depends on how singlet–triplet phase evolves before spin-selective recombination. In this sense, a radical pair is a biochemical interferometer. The relevant variable is not a macroscopic force but a small differential phase shift.

This point is central. A torsion-like, connection-like, pseudo-magnetic, or other spin-dependent perturbation need not push matter strongly. It must bias the relative phase evolution of the radical pair. Spin-selective recombination can then convert a phase bias into a chemical-yield change. The conceptual bridge is: wave-like phase evolution becomes particle-like chemical outcome. That is why radical-pair chemistry is an attractive biological site for a weak-field hypothesis.

The same argument also gives a constraint. A common-mode perturbation that affects both radical sites equally may largely cancel. The sensitive channel is differential: one radical site must experience a slightly different effective precession than the other. This is where chirality becomes important.

Chirality as a Differential Projector

Chirality is not an intrinsic property of the singlet–triplet basis. It belongs to the molecular scaffold. Biological media are deeply chiral: proteins, DNA, membranes, hydration shells, and many electron-transfer pathways possess handed structure. Chiral molecules can couple molecular handedness to spin-selective electron dynamics, as described in the chiral-induced spin selectivity literature (Naaman et al., 2019).

In the present model, chirality serves a specific function. It converts a global axial or handed perturbation into a site-differential molecular response. An external perturbation that would otherwise be common-mode may become biologically legible after it passes through a chiral scaffold. A left-handed and right-handed molecular environment may not project the same perturbation in the

same way. This provides a plausible route from weak external asymmetry to singlet–triplet phase bias.

Torsion-Like and Connection-Like Perturbations

The most speculative part of the model is the identity of the weak perturbation. This paper uses the phrase torsion-like or connection-like cautiously. In strict minimal Einstein–Cartan theory, torsion is algebraically sourced by spin density and does not propagate as a free long-range wave. Therefore, minimal Einstein–Cartan torsion cannot by itself supply the remote source channel proposed here. A remote or external channel would require a propagating torsion extension, an emergent effective connection, a medium-specific pseudo-magnetic interaction, or another weak spin-dependent perturbation with similar coupling structure.

For this reason, the physical field is not treated as established. It is treated as a candidate input class. The paper’s main contribution is not the assertion that torsion explains remote viewing. It is the source–receiver architecture and the experimental program that can test whether reports follow surface form, encoded form, geometry, entropy gradients, or embodied template resonance.

Known constraints matter. Exotic spin-dependent couplings are strongly pressured by spin-precession and Lorentz-violation bounds (Kostelecký et al., 2008). A viable model cannot rely on large free-space fields that directly perturb electron spins at radical-pair scale. The biologically plausible path is amplification: a very weak perturbation biases a phase-sensitive subsystem, which is then rectified and amplified by active physiology.

Embodied Template Resonance: From Body-State Shift to Report

The final step is cognitive. The body-state perturbation is not yet a drawing. It is a small shift in the receiver’s global embodied state: attention, imagery, somatic salience, affective tone, motor impulse, spatial feeling, or perceptual expectancy. The brain then projects this state shift into familiar templates. These templates may be geometric, somatic, symbolic, emotional, or verbal.

This explains why remote-viewing reports are often fragmentary. A weak source-correlated perturbation may not specify bridge as a semantic object. It may bias templates such as horizontal span, vertical supports, water below, arch, repetition, crossing, enclosure, height, motion, or metallic structure. The report becomes a reconstruction assembled from the receiver’s internal repertoire.

The term holographic is useful only if restricted. It should not mean that the brain is literally an optical hologram. It means that distributed, phase-sensitive, frequency-domain, or interference-like processing may allow partial structure to be reconstructed from nonlocal or distributed cues. Pribram’s earlier and later holonomic work provides a useful analogy for treating perception as reconstruction from distributed structure rather than literal image transmission (Pribram, 1971, 1991). Fourier-domain approaches to vision provide a related empirical bridge, especially because the visual system can be analyzed in spatial-frequency terms (De Valois et al., 1979).

The proposed cognitive chain is therefore: source-correlated perturbation → embodied state shift → template resonance → report. This chain predicts that different viewers may report the same target differently, because the final report is shaped by each receiver’s internal templates, training, memory, imagery style, and motor expression.

Experimental Program: Three Ways to Make the Hypothesis Vulnerable

A mechanism paper should not end with speculation. It should specify experiments that can discriminate among competing interpretations. The present model motivates three experimental paradigms. Each uses structured targets to ask which target layer becomes available to embodied cognition: surface form, encoded form, periodic masking, number, arrangement, or qualitative template.

Table 2. Coherent experimental trilogy generated by the source–receiver model.

Experiment	Central question	Primary contrast
Fourier-holographic targets	Does the response follow the visible target surface or the hidden source encoded by a transform?	Surface score versus source score.
Geometric and periodic maskers	Can regular geometry act as a masker, competing carrier, or surface attractor?	Hidden-source accuracy versus masker-capture descriptors.
Dot/dash numerical carriers	Do numbers become more legible when expressed as spatial geometry rather than analytic symbols?	Digit, count, arrangement, spacing, and qualitative-carrier effects.

Experiment 1: Surface Form Versus Encoded Form

The first experiment uses Fourier or holographic targets to separate the visible surface from the encoded source. In ordinary remote-viewing targets, surface and source are usually the same. A photograph of a bridge both looks like a bridge and means bridge. Holography itself begins with wavefront reconstruction rather than ordinary surface-image display, and later holographic-brain discussions emphasized the distinction between visible interference structure and recoverable image structure (Gabor, 1948; Talbot, 1991). A holographic or Fourier-domain target can therefore separate these layers. The physical target may look like dots, speckles, interference fringes, phase noise, or a frequency spectrum while encoding a spiral, arch, bridge, grid, or silhouette.

The core design is simple. Select a source image. Generate several representations: the original image, Fourier magnitude, Fourier phase, phase-only reconstruction, computer-generated hologram, phase-randomized control, and phase/magnitude hybrid. The viewer is blind to both the source and the representation type. The response is judged twice: once against the visible physical target and once against the hidden source image.

The primary variable is the difference between source matching and surface matching. If the viewer describes speckles, dots, rings, or transform features, the response follows the physical surface. If the viewer describes the hidden spiral, arch, grid, or silhouette, the response follows latent encoded structure. If the response contains only general terms such as repetition, radiality, curvature, interference, enclosure, or texture, the result supports a low-dimensional template-resonance interpretation rather than full image transmission.

Phase/magnitude hybrids make the experiment sharper. For two images, one can construct a hybrid target with the Fourier magnitude of image A and the phase of image B. If responses follow the phase donor, the result aligns with the signal-processing observation that phase can preserve much of the intelligible structure of images (Oppenheim & Lim, 1981). If responses follow magnitude, the accessible layer may be spatial-frequency energy, contrast, or periodicity rather than full structure.

This experiment does not prove that the brain is a hologram. Its value is more specific. It asks whether remote-viewing-like reports follow the physical surface, the latent encoded source, the spectral structure, or the receiver's own low-dimensional templates.

Experiment 2: Geometric and Periodic Grids as Possible Maskers

The second experiment generalizes a simple idea: regular geometry may not be neutral. A periodic grid, lattice, dot matrix, line field, or repeated surface pattern can be treated as a geometric carrier. If target geometry contributes to a source or scattering signature, a regular grid placed in the

target stack may alter the effective target. It may block, mask, compete with, or be perceived as part of the target.

The term masker is preferable to shield. Shield implies a binary blocking mechanism. Masker allows several outcomes. The grid may reduce hidden-source accuracy. It may capture the report, causing viewers to draw grid-like or periodic structure. It may be perceived as an added surface while the hidden source remains accessible. Or it may have no measurable effect.

The target-side design uses identical hidden source images presented under several surface conditions: no overlay, plain matched material, periodic grid, rotated grid, random-line pattern matched for ink density, dot matrix, and grid-only controls. The viewer is not told which layer is intended. Responses are scored against the hidden source, the surface masker, and the composite target.

The receiver-side control is equally important. A visible grid in the viewer's local environment could alter drawing style through ordinary perceptual priming or motor constraint. Therefore, target-side grid conditions should be compared with receiver-side grid conditions, such as using grid paper locally, placing a grid near the viewer, or sealing a grid near the receiver while the target remains unchanged. This distinguishes target-stack effects from local cognitive priming.

A parameter sweep can test whether any effect depends on geometry rather than generic complexity. Variables include grid spacing, line width, contrast, orientation, intersection density, anisotropy, and periodicity. A geometry-mediated effect should depend systematically on these variables. If random-line controls have the same effect as periodic grids, clutter or entropy may be the relevant variable rather than periodic geometry.

Experiment 3: Dots, Dashes, Numbers, and Qualitative Carriers

The third experiment addresses a persistent observation: numbers are difficult remote-viewing targets. But numbers are not only abstract symbols. They can be expressed as dots, dashes, arrays, ratios, rhythms, spatial intervals, angles, or paths. The question is whether numerical targets become more accessible when converted from analytic symbols into geometry.

The simplest design could represent the same number in multiple ways: Arabic digit, dot count, dash count, rectangular array, circular array, radial arrangement, random dot cloud, Morse-like rhythm, and proportional spacing. The viewer is not told that the target is numerical. Responses are scored for count accuracy, geometry accuracy, and qualitative gestalt. A viewer who fails to name the number but draws the arrangement may still be accessing target geometry.

A second design holds number constant and varies arrangement. Sixteen dots, for example, could be displayed as a 4×4 grid, a circle, a spiral, a line, two clusters of eight, a radial form, or a random cloud. This asks whether count or arrangement dominates. If all conditions evoke similar numerical impressions, count may matter. If reports differ by specific layout and/or quantity, as may be relevant to BioGeometry as a design tradition, carrier geometry is primary. BioGeometry treats shapes, numbers, proportions, colors, motion, and sound as qualitative carriers capable of producing different biological or environmental effects. The present paper does not assume those claims are established physics; it uses them only as a hypothesis-generating design language for constructing blinded target classes involving number, spacing, proportion, chirality, and arrangement (Karim, 2010, 2016, 2022; Gin, 2015).

Dots and dashes are also different carriers. Dots emphasize position, density, spacing, and count. Dashes add orientation, length, axis, and rhythm. Spiral dashes introduce handedness. Clockwise and counterclockwise arrangements can be matched for number and ink density while differing in chirality. This makes the dot/dash paradigm a compact way to test number, geometry, chirality, and qualitative carrier effects.

Retrospective Corpus Analysis: What Existing Archives May Already Contain

The model also suggests a retrospective program. Large remote-viewing archives, including published SRI material and the Star Gate Archives (May & Marwaha, 2018a, 2018b), may contain underanalyzed variables. Earlier scoring often emphasized target categories, objects, and mid-level semantic descriptors. Some fuzzy-set approaches intentionally avoided very low-level elements such as simple lines and geometric shapes in favor of elements such as buildings, bridges, roads, waterfalls, texture, or repeat motif (May et al., 2000). That leaves a gap: the exact variables emphasized by the present model may have been present in drawings but underweighted in analysis.

Entropy Direction and Local Ordering

The first retrospective analysis should code targets for entropy-gradient magnitude and for the direction of local ordering or disordering. Disorder examples include combustion, explosion, evaporation, melting, decay, turbulence, dispersal, and energetic release. Local-ordering examples include freezing, condensation, crystallization, assembly, construction, alignment, containment, and biological growth. The key question is whether responses preferentially match gradient magnitude, local entropy increase, or local ordering.

This analysis should be framed as hypothesis-generating unless performed with strict blinding, a frozen codebook, and validation data. The danger is retrospective interpretation. A training set can be used to develop coding categories; a validation set should then test them without modification.

Geometry-Primitive Analysis

The second retrospective analysis should code both targets and drawings for geometric primitives: line, curve, circle, arc, spiral, triangle, square, grid, parallel lines, crossing lines, concentric forms, radial forms, enclosure, verticality, diagonal structure, water/land interface, left/right handedness, and repeated motif. The analysis should compare feature presence in responses when the same feature is present in the target against feature presence when it is absent.

This avoids a base-rate trap. Viewers may draw circles, lines, and boxes often. The meaningful test is not whether viewers draw circles, but whether circle-like drawings occur more often when target candidates contain circle-like structures than when they do not. Decoy-based comparison is preferable: each response should be compared against the actual target and matched decoys.

Table 3. Retrospective corpus variables suggested by the model.

Coding domain	Examples	Reason for inclusion
Entropy direction	Local ordering, local disordering, neutral/static, mixed	Tests whether gradient sign matters, not only gradient magnitude.
Target dynamics	Static, moving, rotating, heating, cooling, biological, electrical	Tests whether dynamic and state-changing targets are more legible.
Geometry primitives	Line, curve, circle, grid, spiral, enclosure, radiality, verticality	Tests whether reports are better explained by low-level geometry than semantic labels.
Handedness/chirality	Left/right spiral, clockwise/counterclockwise motion, helical forms	Tests chiral or axial structure predicted by the receiver model.
Drawing morphology	Layering, repeated strokes, orientation, motor rhythm, perspective shifts	Treats drawing as primary data rather than illustration.

Coding domain	Examples	Reason for inclusion
Surface/source ambiguity	Physical photograph, feedback image, artist rendering, map, coordinate target	Tests whether viewers follow source, surface, feedback, or tasking structure.

Discussion

The central contribution of this paper is not a claim that remote viewing is solved. It is a testable architecture. The model converts a vague question—can someone see a hidden target?—into a set of sharper questions. Which target variables are most accessible: surface form, encoded form, entropy gradient, geometry, chirality, motion, local ordering, or symbolic meaning? Which receiver variables matter: attention, redox state, hydration, training, template repertoire, physiological coherence, or feedback? Which report channels carry the best information: words, drawings, gestures, somatic impressions, or immediate glyphs?

The model also clarifies what should not be claimed. A simple retarded field cannot by itself explain precognitive target selection. Reports of precognition in the literature require either a temporal-boundary extension, a block-time interpretation, or a different theory of target selection. The present model can accommodate the receiver-side biology and report reconstruction, but it does not solve the full time problem.

Similarly, the torsion-like input is conditional. Minimal Einstein–Cartan torsion is too local and too weak for the role assigned here. A propagating torsion-like field or connection-like perturbation would be an extension, an emergent effective interaction, or a phenomenological placeholder. That is why the experiments are framed in terms of target structure and response structure rather than as direct torsion detection.

The strongest immediate path is therefore empirical. The proposed experimental trilogy does not require the field identity to be known in advance. A Fourier-holographic target test can determine whether responses follow surface, source, phase, magnitude, or template. A geometric-masker test can determine whether periodic carriers alter hidden-source access or report morphology. A dot/dash numerical-carrier test can determine whether numbers become more accessible when represented geometrically. Each result would constrain the mechanism.

The retrospective corpus program is equally important. If archived sessions already contain systematic geometry or entropy-direction patterns that earlier scoring systems did not emphasize, that would justify prospective experiments. If no such patterns appear under rigorous coding, the model is weakened. In either case, the hypothesis becomes vulnerable to data.

Limitations and Boundary Conditions

Several limitations must be stated plainly. First, the remote-viewing literature is heterogeneous and controversial. Positive claims, failed replications, methodological disputes, and operational anecdotes must not be treated as equivalent evidence. Second, the biological mechanism proposed here is conditional. Radical-pair sensitivity, chiral projection, redox/chromatin amplification, and body-state susceptibility are plausible components but not demonstrated as a remote-viewing mechanism. Third, exotic spin-dependent interactions face strong experimental constraints. Fourth, retrospective analysis can easily become biased unless codebooks, decoys, and validation sets are used. Fifth, the model may explain only a subset of the claimed phenomenology, if any.

These limitations are not fatal to a hypothesis paper. They define what must be tested. The proposal is useful only if it produces discriminating experiments and retrospective analyses.

Implications and Applications

The proposed framework shifts remote-viewing research from the broad question of whether a hidden image is seen to the more precise question of which target variables become available to

embodied cognition. It suggests that future studies should manipulate geometry, entropy gradients, encoded versus surface form, chirality, and numerical representation rather than relying only on ordinary photographic targets. It also provides a retrospective path for reanalyzing existing remote-viewing archives using target-response geometry, signed local entropy change, and drawing morphology. More broadly, the framework may inform studies of weak biological signal detection, nonanalytic perception, predictive cognition, and the role of phase-sensitive biochemical processes in subtle state changes.

Conclusion

Remote viewing has often been framed either as an impossible claim or as an unexplained ability. Neither framing is sufficient for scientific progress. If the phenomenon is real even in weak form, it should have structure. Reports should depend on target properties, receiver state, and the relation between physical source structure and embodied interpretation. This paper proposes a source–receiver model that makes those dependencies explicit.

The target is treated as a structured physical system rather than a message sender. The receiver is treated as an active biological phase-sensitive medium rather than a passive antenna. The conscious report is treated as a template-based reconstruction rather than a transmitted picture. The result is a conditional but testable model: target structure may shape a weak source-correlated perturbation; biology may amplify it; cognition may translate it into sketches, symbols, and gestalts.

The next step is not more general speculation. The next step is disciplined target design and corpus analysis: Fourier-holographic targets, geometric maskers, dot/dash numerical carriers, entropy-direction coding, and geometry-primitive scoring. A useful theory of remote viewing must be able to fail. The purpose of this model is to make failure possible.

AI Use Disclosure: AI language-model assistance was used during manuscript development for refinement of prose.

Conflicts of Interest: The author reports no conflicts of interest relevant to this theoretical manuscript.

Data Availability: No new empirical data are reported in this manuscript. Proposed retrospective analyses would use archived and published materials, subject to availability and appropriate documentation.

Ethics Statement: No human-participant data were collected for this theoretical manuscript. Any prospective remote-viewing experiments described here would require appropriate ethical review, informed consent, preregistration where feasible, and careful blinding procedures.

References

- De Valois, R. L., De Valois, K. K., & Yund, E. W. (1979). Responses of striate cortex cells to grating and checkerboard patterns. *The Journal of Physiology*, 291, 483–505.
- Gabor, D. (1948). A new microscopic principle. *Nature*, 161, 777–778. <https://doi.org/10.1038/161777a0>
- Gin, J. (2015). The science of BioGeometry. *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy*, 11(2), 290–309.
- Hore, P. J., & Mouritsen, H. (2016). The radical-pair mechanism of magnetoreception. *Annual Review of Biophysics*, 45, 299–344. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biophys-032116-094545>
- Karim, I. (2010). *Back to a future for mankind: BioGeometry*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Karim, I. (2016). *BioGeometry signatures: Harmonizing the body's subtle energy exchange with the environment*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Karim, I. (2022). *Hidden reality: The BioGeometry physics of quality: The science of subtle energy and life force*. BioGeometry Energy Systems, Limited.
- Kostelecký, V. A., Russell, N., & Tasson, J. D. (2008). New constraints on torsion from Lorentz violation. *Physical Review Letters*, 100(11), Article 111102. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.100.111102>

- May, E. C., & Marwaha, S. B. (2015). Rethinking extrasensory perception: Toward a multiphasic model of precognition. *SAGE Open*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015576056>
- May, E. C., & Marwaha, S. B. (Eds.). (2018a). *The Star Gate archives: Reports of the United States Government sponsored psi program, 1972–1995: Vol. 1. Remote viewing, 1972–1984*. McFarland.
- May, E. C., & Marwaha, S. B. (Eds.). (2018b). *The Star Gate archives: Reports of the United States Government sponsored psi program, 1972–1995: Vol. 2. Remote viewing, 1985–1995*. McFarland.
- May, E. C., Spottiswoode, S. J. P., & Faith, L. V. (2000). The correlation of the gradient of Shannon entropy and anomalous cognition: Toward an AC sensory system. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 14(1), 53–72.
- Naaman, R., Paltiel, Y., & Waldeck, D. H. (2019). Chiral molecules and the electron spin. *Nature Reviews Chemistry*, 3, 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41570-019-0087-1>
- Oppenheim, A. V., & Lim, J. S. (1981). The importance of phase in signals. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 69(5), 529–541. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PROC.1981.12022>
- Pribram, K. H. (1971). *Languages of the brain: Experimental paradoxes and principles in neuropsychology*. Prentice-Hall.
- Pribram, K. H. (1991). *Brain and perception: Holonomy and structure in figural processing*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Puthoff, H. E., & Targ, R. (1976). A perceptual channel for information transfer over kilometer distances: Historical perspective and recent research. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 64(3), 329–354. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PROC.1976.10113>
- Ritz, T., Adem, S., & Schulten, K. (2000). A model for photoreceptor-based magnetoreception in birds. *Biophysical Journal*, 78(2), 707–718. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3495\(00\)76629-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3495(00)76629-X)
- Talbot, M. (1991). *The holographic universe*. Bantam Books.
- Targ, R. (2019). What do we know about psi? The first decade of remote-viewing research and operations at Stanford Research Institute. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 33(4), 569–592. <https://doi.org/10.31275/2019/1669>
- Targ, R., & Puthoff, H. E. (1974). Information transmission under conditions of sensory shielding. *Nature*, 251(5476), 602–607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/251602a0>
- Tart, C. T., Puthoff, H. E., & Targ, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Mind at large: IEEE symposia on the nature of extrasensory perception*. Hampton Roads. (Original symposia published 1979)

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.