The Prometheus Protocols

for Public Experiments of Remote Viewing

OVERVIEW AND INSTRUCTIONS

Version 1.1.3

by Courtney Brown

Painting by Heinrich Füger, c1817

Table of Contents

The Prometheus Protocols℠: Overview

The Prometheus Protocols℠ are procedures used—in part—to conduct public scientific experiments involving the remote-viewing phenomenon. The Prometheus Protocols℠ are also used to reliably and verifiably employ remote viewing in experiments involving prediction. These are scientific research protocols, which differ from operational and training procedures used with remote viewing. Just as Prometheus is said to have brought fire (and thus light) to mankind, these procedures enable the public to reliably witness demonstrations of information transfer across time and space. This offers the potential of lifting the veil of blindness as humankind faces the future.

Remote viewing is a complex mental phenomenon involving the transfer of perceptual data across time and space. Remote viewers are individuals who have mastered a mental process of structured data collection that allows them to record perceptions of places, events, objects, and people even though the remote viewers themselves have no physical contact with these things. In order to maintain scientific validity, the data collection process must be placed within a set of rigorously structured rules and procedures that both maximize the accuracy of the remote-viewing data as well as allow the data to be evaluated and verified. The Prometheus Protocols℠ describe the rules and procedures that are necessary in order to properly handle and process remote-viewing data and related components such that the total sum can be part of a scientifically valid experimental design.

That which the remote viewer is assigned to describe is called a "target," and the target is considered the focus of perception for the remote viewer when the data collection is performed. For example, a remote viewer may be asked to perceive and describe (or simply "view") a target that turns out to be the Taj Mahal, or Mt. Everest, or some part of a World War II battle. Remote-viewing data collected for scientific experiments are, of course, always collected under "blind" conditions, which means that the remote viewers are kept in a state of total ignorance with respect to the target choice at the time when they remote view. Choosing a target for a remote-viewing experiment is called "tasking" or "targeteering."

Every remote-viewing target has a "target time," which refers to the target's date and time that the remote viewer is supposed to perceive. Experimental evidence indicates that remote viewing is not limited with respect to target times. For example, a target can be in the past, such as the Taj Mahal at 12 noon local time on 1 January 1978. Similarly, the target can also have a future target time. Indeed, it is possible for a past or future target to be determined after the remote-viewing sessions are already completed, a process known as "future tasking." The way in which remote-viewing targets are determined is crucial to the success and scientific validity of the remote-viewing process itself, and this is addressed within the Prometheus Protocols℠.

The Prometheus Protocols℠ also address how remote-viewing data should be handled once they are recorded by a remote viewer. Remote-viewing data must follow a chain of custody from the moment that they are recorded by a remote viewer to the time when they are delivered to an analyst, and potentially revealed to the public. For remote-viewing data to be considered valid within a scientific context, the data themselves must remain free from all potentially corrupting outside influence, and the process for choosing the target must be verifiably disconnected from the handling of the remote-viewing data. Issues relating to the handling of the remote-viewing data under such conditions are described here as an aspect of the Prometheus Protocols℠.

Target selection and handling is a crucial part of any scientifically valid use of remote viewing. Target pools and chosen targets must follow a clear chain of custody, and there must be no chance of informational leakage between the target selection process and the remote-viewing process. Future-tasking experimental designs are often ideal for such purposes since the target choice does not even exist at the time of remote-viewing. Relevant target selection and handing issues are addresses within the Prometheus Protocols℠.

Personnel Involved In Public Remote-Viewing Experiments

To conduct a public scientific experiment with remote viewing, personnel assignments are crucial. All of the roles listed below must be filled prior to beginning the experiment.

Remote Viewer: The remote viewer collects perceptual data using a structured method of data collection. The data are normally collected using paper and pen, although some remote viewers use other recording methods.

Group Manager: This person coordinates the activities for a particular remote-viewing group within the context of a multi-group project. This involves communicating with remote viewers, making sure remote-viewing sessions are submitted on time, and following through on various tasks associated with coordinating group activities related to the project.

Session Assembler: In some situations, a viewer is not technically capable of transmitting a remote-viewing session to the session collector (see below). In such situations, a session assembler serves an intermediary role by receiving the remote-viewing session from the remote viewer, and then scanning the session into a computer as a pdf document. The session assembler then sends the session to the session collector as an email attachment. The session assembler can also transmit a session to the session collector as a fax. The session assembler is normally someone who has regular contact with a given group of remote viewers and who has a computer, a scanner, and a fax.

Session Collector: The person who collects all remote-viewing sessions, normally as pdf or faxed documents. The session collector is responsible for encrypting the sessions using 256 bit encryption. The session collector can also work as the web controller for the project.

Web Controller: The web controller takes all of the encrypted remote-viewing sessions from the Session Collector and uploads them to a publicly accessible web site for distribution.

Target Writer: A person who completes the structural design of the targets chosen for a remote-viewing experiment. This person does not necessarily need to be the tasker. If a tasker is used in a public remote-viewing experiment to choose a target for the experiment, the tasker may then give the target to a target writer to rephrase the target such that is has an acceptable grammatical and structural form suitable for the experiment. The target writer may also obtain graphical imagery to supplement the target definition. The Google Earth software is often useful for obtaining royalty-free target imagery. The primary task of the target writer is to polish the target chosen by the tasker such that the target has all necessary components and is written in an acceptable format.

Tasking Timeline Possibilities

In general, there are four primary ways that targets may be assigned (or tasked) with respect to remote-viewing sessions. Targets may be chosen from a pool of targets by a truly random process, or targets may be chosen by a person. The method of target selection for any particular experiment will depend on the scientific necessities involved with any given experimental setting. However, it does not matter how targets are chosen from a remote-viewing perspective as long as the targets are handled appropriately. The key points is that (1) there should be only one target for each session, (2) under no circumstances should the analyses of remote-viewing sessions involve a comparison of the remote-viewing data with more than one target, and (3) each remote-viewing session should be closed by the remote viewer who conducted the session, or a truly unbiased analyst. These points are explained below.

Based on recent research of the remote-viewing phenomenon itself (*Remote Viewing: The Science and Theory of Nonphysical Perception*, Brown 2006), the key factor in determining why a remote viewer focuses on one particular target as compared with, say, any random set of imagery, is due to a telepathic connection between the remote viewer at the time that the session is being conducted and the person who first analyzes the remote-viewing data by comparing it with the actual target. The act of comparing the remote-viewing data with the actual target for the first time is called "closing the session." If the remote-viewer is the person who is closing his or her own session, which means that the remote-viewer is the first person who is allowed to compare the remote-viewing data to the actual target, then the remote viewer is completing a telepathic connection with himself or herself. Thus, it is normal to assume that the person closing the remote-viewing session is making the session-target comparison in the future of the time in which the remote-viewing session is conducted. Thus, it is crucial that those who close any remote-viewing session harbor no conscious bias with respect to the target or the viewer, since that bias will have an impact on the perceptions of the remote viewer. This is not to say that the remote-viewer is simply reading the mind of the closer, but rather the thoughts of the closer appear to act in the manner of a targeting laser to direct the perceptions of the remote viewer to the actual target. If someone other than the remote-viewer closes the remote-viewing session, care should be taken to ensure that the closer harbors no biases for or against the remote viewer, and that the closer knows to mentally focus only on the target itself during the closing process.

Under no circumstances should remote-viewing sessions be analyzed by "blind" judges who evaluate the remote-viewing data with respect to a pool of targets. For example, when judges compare remote-viewing data to a pool of five potential targets, one real and four decoys, in order to see if they can discern which target the data best describes, research has shown definitively that the judging process itself will telepathically corrupt the data-collection process, and the data will likely reflect any of the potential targets. (See Brown 2006 for a full explanation of this phenomenon.) Experiments that use this

design are fatally flawed, and their results are not valid.

There are five sequencing arrangements for placing the viewing, the tasking, and the target time. These arrangements are shown as scenarios 1 though 4a and 4b in figure 1. For public experiments involving remote viewing, scenarios 3 and 4 are preferred due to the added security allowed with respect to the scientific method. Scenarios 3 and 4 are also used in experiments involving predicting the future. The crucial aspect of scenarios 3 and 4 is that the remote viewer conducts the remote-viewing session at a time (the "viewing time") prior to the time when the target is tasked (the "tasking time") for that session. Since the target has not even been chosen when the viewer is conducting the session, there is no possibility that the viewer could have been tipped-off regarding the target choice, the consequences of which would obviously be to corrupt the experiment. Furthermore, if the target is chosen by a trustworthy method, such as a truly random event, then the scientific credibility of the outcome is enhanced.

The main difference between scenarios 3 and 4 is the target time. In scenario 3, the target time is in the past relative to the tasking and viewing time. This would occur, for example, if the target is the Battle of Dunkirk during World War II, the remote-viewing session is being conducted in January of 2006, and the choice of the target is made in February of 2006. Thus, the sequence of events for scenario 3 is first the target time, followed by the viewing time, and finally the tasking time. In scenario 4, the target time is in the future of the viewing time. Two target times are offered for scenario 4 in figure 1, where the first is a target time after the viewing time but before the tasking time, and the second is a target time that is in the future of both the viewing time and the tasking time. An example of the former would be if the viewing time is during April of 2006, the target is the peak of Mount Everest some time and day in May 2006, and the decision to assign this target to the remote-viewing session is made in June of 2006. An example of the latter would be if the viewing time is during June of 2006, the choice to assign the target of Mount Everest to the remote-viewing session is made in July 2006, and the target time is in August 2006. There are theoretical reasons (not explained here) that suggest that the relative success of scenarios 4a and 4b with respect to prediction accuracy may not be equivalent.

Of course, for any remote-viewing experiment to work, the tasking process must be ignorant of the viewing process. That is, the knowledge of the content of the remote-viewing session must not be known to anyone involved in the target selection process. This complicates matters since the public must have access to all remote-viewing sessions prior to the occurrence of the target selection process. Thus, the problem boils down to how to distribute the remote-viewing data without leaking the information to the tasking agents, thereby corrupting the experiment from a scientific perspective. The solution to this problem is to use secure encryption for most data and target distributional matters, a subject that is covered further below.

Session Scanning Requirements and Procedures

For any remote-viewing experiment involving the public, it is essential that the remote-viewing sessions themselves be available in a form that allows easy access of high quality images via the Internet. The standard format that should be used for scanned pages is Adobe pdf. Adobe pdf files can be read using a number of programs, including the ubiquitous and free Adobe Reader.

Acceptable quality pdf files can be created using a number of programs, although Adobe Acrobat is the program of choice to be used if it is available. Inexpensive college and high school educational pricing is available for Adobe Acrobat. Care should be taken to scan the session pages directly into pdf format using a program such as Adobe Acrobat. One should not scan session pages into a graphics program for subsequent translation into pdf format. Using a graphics program such as Photoshop, for example, will usually increase the size of the pdf file intolerably. The goal of a graphics program such as Photoshop is to maintain image quality at the expense of file size. On the other hand, programs such as Adobe Acrobat are designed to produce high quality files that have very small file sizes.

To scan a remote-viewing session directly into Adobe Acrobat, one must first have a scanner, preferably one with a sheet feeder. Such scanners are common in all-in-one printers that have scanning and fax capabilities. Most scanners have TWAIN drivers, which means that programs on the computer can operate the scanner from within the program itself (such as Adobe Acrobat).

Assuming one has a sheet-fed scanner and Adobe Acrobat, begin by placing the remote-viewing session in the sheet feeder of the scanner. Then open Adobe Acrobat and choose File > Create PDF > From Scanner. Select your scanner and click scan. Depending on the driver software that came with your scanner, you will have various options for selecting the properties of the scanning process. You want to be sure to select a scanning mode that is black and white (not color or grayscale). You will also have to specify a resolution. Normally, 150 dpi (dots per inch) will do fine for a remote-viewing session written with a black ink pen, and this setting will produce the smallest file size. However, you can also scan at 300 dpi and still have a small file size and great resolution as long as you are sure to scan only in black and white. Color and grayscale scans will have much larger file sizes and should be avoided.

Some scanners do not come with TWAIN drivers. Rather, they work with their own drivers and packaged software only. In such cases, you may not be able to scan from within the Adobe Acrobat program, but you still should be able to scan the session directly to a pdf format file using the software that comes with the scanner. For example, Fujitsu's S510 ScanSnap scanner works this way.

The finished pdf file of your scanned 10-20 page remote-viewing session should be between 150-400K in size. If you first scanned your session into, say, Photoshop, you may have a size of a few megabytes, which is not acceptable. After the session is scanned, it needs to be sent as an email attachment to the session collector.

Encryption

Encryption is crucial for all public experiments involving remote viewing, and there are several areas where encryption must be used to guarantee the scientific validity of such experiments. Essentially, the public must have access to encrypted remote-viewing sessions, encrypted target descriptions, and encrypted target selection criteria. Each of these needs are described below.

Once remote-viewing sessions are completed, it is necessary for the sessions to be made available to the public for download via the Internet. The public needs to know that the remote-viewing sessions being publicly compared with the targets in the experiment are the unaltered originals. If the public can download encrypted versions of the sessions, the validity of the remote-viewing data can be subsequently assured. Passwords to decrypt the sessions can be posted online after the targets have been selected for the experiment, and the public can verify that the data are unaltered from their original form.

Often when targets are selected from a pool of targets by a truly random event, it is necessary for the public to know the pool of targets as well as the nature of the random event. All this information needs to be available to the public in encrypted format before the remote-viewing sessions are completed and made available for download.

For the overall process to be transparent and to ensure scientific validity, the experiment must be structured such that it is impossible for the remote viewers to know the target in advance of conducting the remote-viewing sessions. Thus, the random event that determines the target must be such that it is truly random, and the random event must occur after the remote-viewing sessions are made available for public download via the Internet. One strategy that has been used in the past in experiments conducted at The Farsight Institute is to use the last three integer digits of the DOW Jones average for a future date to select a target from a pool of targets. Thus, if there is a pool of 999 targets, and the DOW Jones average for June 1st is 10,456.45, then target #456 from the pool is the target selected for a given session. Of course, an encrypted scan of the session must have been made available for download by the public substantially prior to June 1st. Moreover, the plan to use the last three digits of the DOW Jones average for June 1st must also have been made available in encrypted form to the pubic prior to that date so that the public can have assurance that the target was indeed picked from the pool by a truly random process. It is important that no information regarding the nature of the random process be leaked to the public prior to the date of disclosure (in this example, June 1st). This prevents someone from saying that an insider manipulated the process to obtain a certain result. In the current example, this would entail having a Wall Street executive manipulate the DOW Jones average for a given day to obtain a certain numerical result. However, a random process should always be used such that such manipulation would be exceptionally unlikely to occur even if the information (e.g., the fact that the DOW Jones number for a certain date was being used) was leaked.

The software that is currently used by The Farsight Institute for encryption is the WinZip compression software (www.winzip.com). This software is supplied by the Corel Corporation, it is inexpensive, it is easily obtained by the public, it is easy to use, and it offers secure 256 bit encryption within a convenient compressed zip format perfect for web-based downloading.

Sometimes it is necessary for the random event to select a target assignment rule rather than a target. This often happens when the pool of targets is relatively small (for example, 24), and viewers are doing sessions for many of the targets in the pool. Thus, one needs to assign a particular target to a particular session, and there can be many possible combinations available. For example, let us say that there are 24 targets, and each viewer does 24 sessions. The question becomes which target to assign to which session. The random target assignment rule does this.

In such situations at The Farsight Institute, computer software is used to produce, say, 999 possible target assignment rules, where session numbers are matched with target numbers. The computer software that is use to do this is called the Session Analysis Machine (or simply, SAM), and it is available from the web site of The Farsight Institute for free, www.farsight.org). Below are four examples of such assignment rules.

S(ession)#:T(arget)#

Target Assignment #1 >> S1:T6, S2:T15, S3:T19, S4:T7, S5:T23, S6:T22, S7:T12, S8:T10, S9:T2, S10:T17, S11:T21, S12:T14, S13:T3, S14:T24, S15:T4, S16:T1, S17:T20, S18:T18, S19:T16, S20:T9, S21:T5, S22:T11, S23:T13, S24:T8

Target Assignment #2 >> S1:T10, S2:T3, S3:T22, S4:T8, S5:T1, S6:T2, S7:T15, S8:T18, S9:T9, S10:T20, S11:T11, S12:T12, S13:T16, S14:T7, S15:T17, S16:T21, S17:T14, S18:T19, S19:T4, S20:T23, S21:T24, S22:T5, S23:T6, S24:T13

Target Assignment #3 >> S1:T22, S2:T18, S3:T14, S4:T10, S5:T8, S6:T3, S7:T12, S8:T15, S9:T4, S10:T2, S11:T6, S12:T7, S13:T9, S14:T11, S15:T13, S16:T17, S17:T21, S18:T23, S19:T24, S20:T20, S21:T16, S22:T5, S23:T1, S24:T19

Target Assignment #4 >> S1:T13, S2:T9, S3:T24, S4:T22, S5:T16, S6:T12, S7:T10, S8:T2, S9:T3, S10:T20, S11:T17, S12:T5, S13:T18, S14:T7, S15:T1, S16:T8, S17:T6, S18:T11, S19:T15, S20:T4, S21:T14, S22:T19, S23:T21, S24:T23

As shown in the above four examples, for each possible target assignment rule, remote-viewing session numbers are assigned to target numbers. Thus, in the first assignment shown above, session #1 is assigned to target #6, session #2 is assigned to target #15, and so on. The list of targets is found in a separate encrypted file.

In the above example list of four target assignment possibilities, there are 24 targets that have to be assigned to 24 remote viewing sessions, and there are four different ways this can be done. Some remote viewers may complete fewer than 24 sessions, and a different target assignment rule is used in these situations. Also, while there are only four possible target assignment rules in the above example, in the actual experiment's encrypted target assignment file that is used for a given study and which the public can freely access, there are often 999 such randomized possible target assignment rules. The choice of which target assignment rule is used for the experiment is determined by the dynamic random event (such as the use of the DOW Jones average for a certain date).

How to Construct a Target for a Public Demonstration of Remote Viewing

Nothing is more important to the successful completion of a remote-viewing experiment than the creation of a proper remote-viewing target. I have met many people — from experienced remote viewers to skeptics — who think that target construction is relatively unimportant. They place the abilities of the remote viewer first, assuming that a remote viewer should be able to perceive anything. Skeptics especially seem to trivialize the importance of target construction. Often remote-viewers take up challenges from such skeptics, each side daring the other in an "I told you so!" match, only to be disappointed when the results come in because the target was of a sort that simply will not work with remote viewing. Remote viewing is a nontrivial and complex phenomenon, and a remote viewer cannot simply see "anything" based on whatever a tasker may throw at him or her. Improperly chosen or constructed targets will not work. Properly constructed targets have a decent chance of working, depending on how well the other elements of the experiment are set-up, and on how well the remote viewers do their jobs.

This section sketches out the basic parameters of target construction as it should be used in a public demonstration of remote viewing. It is assumed here that the tasker is someone who may not be a remote viewer, but rather someone of significant reputation who has volunteered to designate targets to be viewed by remote viewers who are operating in a properly constructed public experiment which utilizes all necessary security and scientific controls. The tasker's job is to choose targets that correspond to previously established criteria concerning target construction. If the experimental situation is such that the remote viewers conduct, encrypt, and distribute their sessions prior to a target being selected by the tasker (a "tasking-post" condition), then it would be acceptable in most cases for the essential target to be chosen by the tasker, and then for an experienced target-writer either to approve the target or to suggest minor modifications (i.e., repairs) to the formal language and syntax of the target as long as the tasker has the last say as to the target's meaning.

In determining what would constitute an acceptable target for remote viewing, one has to begin with an understanding of the purpose of the remote-viewing demonstration. The purpose is to convince not just the tasker — but also the public at large — that remote viewing is a real phenomenon. For this reason, all targets chosen for a public demonstration must have notable characteristics which can be unambiguously described by remote viewing. Many people begin by thinking that interesting people make good targets for public demonstrations. But this is not correct. Interesting people are interesting because they have interesting stories to tell, or because there are interesting stories to be told about them. Remote viewing cannot tell stories. People can interpret remote-viewing data to tell a story, but this remains an interpretation. The data themselves rarely yield stories without heavy interpretation of a sort that is not desirable or even possible in a demonstration setting that is focusing on basic descriptive accuracy.

For example, once a person tasked some remote viewers at The Farsight Institute

the target "Richard Nixon," and he wanted us to discern the correct target from a collection of five targets that included four decoys, all names of people. This was a near-impossible test of remote viewing. In that situation, any data for Nixon at any time — before, during, or after he was alive as a human being — would have been acceptable since no further specifications were offered. I am sure that in the tasker's mind, Richard Nixon was an interesting person, and the tasker was probably thinking of all the interesting things that happened around the former U.S. president, including the Vietnam War, the Watergate scandal, the resignation, his famous trip to China ... the works. He might even have wanted the remote viewers to identify Mr. Nixon by name. But this is simply not how remote viewing works. Remote viewers produce lots of low-level descriptive data of a target, and the target needs to have characteristics that lend themselves well to this type of description. The name "Richard Nixon" is as high-level as one can get. Add to this the fact that the target does not specify a context or time or event associated with this person and the target is simply not possible to do in any type of effective manner.

Similarly, a different tasker once briefly considered tasking Institute remote viewers with the target of Tiger Woods playing a particular golf championship. This was better than the Richard Nixon target, since at least a time and place were specified. In this instance perhaps the tasker was influenced in this choice of a target because of a personal interest in the story of Tiger Woods, the magnitude of his personality, his uniqueness to the field of golfing, and so on. Again, these are not criteria that work well with public demonstration targets. Moreover, in plain descriptive terms, Tiger Woods is simply a human subject walking or standing on generally flat, grass-covered land. Even if the remote viewers described a human subject walking on flat land, there is not much unique in that setting to convince the public that the data were obtained through remote viewing. The setting is boring, and boring is not believable in a remote-viewing demonstration.

Good remote-viewing targets must have unique, physical characteristics that unambiguously identify a target. This absolutely means that all good remote-viewing targets must be real and verifiable. Thus, no esoteric or nonverifiable targets should ever be permitted in a public demonstration of remote viewing. The public must be able to easily verify with total certainty the physical characteristics of any given target. If there are mountains at the target site, the public must be able to know this. If there was a nuclear explosion at a target site, the explosion must be a matter of obvious public record. If there is a flying structure (such as an orbiting space station) in the target, the public must be able to know that this structure is real, and so on.

Good remote-viewing targets should have prominent topological features that will attract the attention of a proficient remote viewer. Someone's backyard lawn is a bad remote-viewing target. It is flat land with nothing topologically unique about it. Similarly, a stretch of desert with nothing on it is a terrible remote-viewing target. With such a target, the tasker is asking a viewer to perceive nothing but a flat surface. Remember that the remote viewer will undoubtedly spend approximately an hour in a session thinking that the target must be more complicated than empty flat land. This could even cause the viewer to doubt his or her own data, thereby tempting the conscious

mind to invent data. Thus, good remote-viewing targets must have enough in them to interest both the remote viewer and the public that wants to see truly descriptive results. Thus, a better target would be a mountain, a mountain range, a large cliff, a city with interesting building topologies, a rocket launch, a landing or expedition on the Moon in a location of significant topological variety, and so on. People want to see remote-viewing data that unambiguously describe a target with significant uniqueness in a public demonstration of remote viewing. It is the tasker's job to supply a target that satisfies this requirement.

Avoid targets that are relatively insignificant when compared with their surrounding context. A small object in a backyard lawn (or, similarly, a flower in a house) is such a target. With such a target, the viewer will likely end up describing the yard and house rather than the small object. Such targets are called "embedded targets," since they are typically small components of a larger scene, and this larger scene is often called the "macro-target." In general, and especially with respect to remote-viewing sessions conducted solo (i.e., without a monitor), a tasker should always avoid embedded targets. The viewer will inevitably observe elements of the surrounding macro-target, and unless there is a monitor to help focus the viewer on a particular point within the macro-target, the viewer will likely miss describing the embedded target.

Good targets can also have significant levels of activity. Activity is interesting and often helpful in a public demonstration of remote viewing, although it is not required. Thus, large battle scenes are good targets, both on water and on land. Riots, the burning of cities, parades, wartime events (including major destruction events) are also good targets. Such targets offer lots of interesting activity that is physical in nature, and remote-viewing data can normally describe such activity well.

All remote-viewing targets must include exact time and location descriptions. It is not sufficient to task a landing on the Moon. Rather, a properly written remote-viewing target must explicitly identify a particular landing on the Moon, the time of the landing, and the location of the landing (and/or walking expedition after landing). The tasker does not have to be specific as to the second, or even the minute. But the day and general time should be stated. The time can also be further identified by specifying a specific and well-known event, such as when the words were first spoken on the Moon, "A small step for man, a giant leap for mankind."

If a picture is used to identify a target (always a good idea whenever possible), then one can specify that the target time is the moment that the photograph was taken. If a photograph of a target is used, be sure that it is a photograph that is in the public domain, since the public demonstration will require that the photograph be available for others to see. Many public-domain photographs of well-known historic places and events that would serve well as remote-viewing targets can be obtained as web-art collections that are sold inexpensively in computer software stores. Google Earth is another source of good royalty free pictures. Be sure to avoid pictures that are used for secondary purposes such as advertisements. Such pictures are often highly stylized and processed using filtering techniques available with graphics software. More damaging, such photographs typically have advertising lettering written on them, and the use of such

photos blends the idea of the product being advertised (and all of its commercial uses) into the meaning of the target. Also, such advertising photos are not normally in the public domain.

In general, taskers need to remember that public demonstrations are conducted in order to show people that remote viewing is a real phenomenon. Thus, targets need to have significant physical and event characteristics such that people who examine the data can say that the remote-viewing data described those special characteristics well. This points to the need for most public demonstrations of remote viewing to be designed to have a series of experiments. Just one target and one viewing will normally not convince many people that anything special really happened. People can always say it was just a fluke. Rather, a series of, say, five or ten targets — each viewed sequentially — are normally needed to conduct an effective demonstration of remote viewing. Remember also that not every remote-viewing session works. You need to give the remote viewers enough chances to demonstrate that on average they can do their jobs well. Moreover, the targets in the series need to be chosen such that they are significantly different from each other. Thus, the targets should not all be mountain targets, or all battle targets, or all space targets, and so on. A tasker needs to vary the mix of targets so that the remote viewers really cannot predict what type of target will be next in the series.

To assist in providing the greatest possible variety of target content within any given set of demonstration targets, the following list of target categories is suggested. Taskers may wish to consult this list from time to time to see if a different type of target from a different category may add more variety to their own target ideas. Taskers may supplement this list of target categories with ideas of their own as long as these ideas correspond to the above content parameters.

1. Train, aviation, and maritime events (of all types)
2. Monumental stone structures, with or without activities
3. Manned space flight events of all types
4. Mountains, waterfalls, and other large and significant natural formations, with or without human activities
5. Major wartime battles, riots, terrorist incidents
6. Natural disasters of all types involving significant topological features and activities
7. Notable and topologically distinct structures of all types
8. Governmental leaders and other significant persons at historic moments within significant and topologically distinct settings (such as within or near major structures)
9. Adventurist events, successes, and disasters of all types

Numbered Aspects

Sometimes public demonstration targets are required to have “numbered aspects.” Such aspects are typically used to move a viewer's perspective around one physical central

target location. It is analogous to moving a camera around while taking pictures from a variety of perspectives. This allows the target construction to offer alternative viewing perspectives for one primary target. Numbered aspects can also be used to shift the viewer's perspective in time. When used, there should be a limit of at most three numbered aspects, and the first numbered aspect should be simply a repetition of the primary target cue. For example, if the target is the Titanic, then one numbered aspect may be when the ship first encounters the iceberg with which it fatally collided, yet another aspect can be when it is half-way submerged, and yet a final numbered aspect can be when it first rests on the surface of the ocean bottom after it sank. Similarly, if the target is the destruction of the World Trade Center buildings in New York on 11 September 2001, then the first numbered aspect can be when the first jet collides with the first building, and a second numbered aspect can be immediately after the second building has collapsed. With all numbered aspects, the tasker should specify the perspective that the viewer should assume when describing the target. Thus, if the viewer should be describing the World Trade Center attack from the perspective of the New Jersey shore in Liberty Square Park in Jersey City, then this should be specified in the appropriate numbered aspect. The second numbered aspect may specify that the viewer shift the viewing perspective to Ground Zero itself where all the rubble is piled up.

Note that the data for each aspect can overlap with the expected content for other aspects. After moving one's perception to a new numbered aspect, in many cases a viewer may continue to perceive data that are clearly related to another target aspect. That is, the movement exercises conducted by the viewers to the various numbered aspects usually move the perspective of the viewers to those aspects. But sometimes a viewer's perception remains with the prior or another aspect for reasons that are not entirely understood. It is known that the problem is exacerbated when the target aspects are substantively distinct (see below). Thus, the remote-viewing data for each aspect are normally evaluated broadly with respect to their correspondence with known characteristics of the target, even if those characteristics are applicable to one or more numbered target aspects.

There is a common temptation for taskers to use numbered aspects to answer complex plot or story questions by shifting the perception of the viewers across a set of substantively distinct separate targets. This must be avoided. For example, one may want to know who shot John F. Kennedy, and a tasker may write an initial numbered aspect to focus on Kennedy being hit by a bullet while riding in a car in Dallas, and a later numbered aspect to focus on the assassin trying to escape. These are two separate targets, and it is normally not wise to combine them into one target using numbered aspects. In such cases in which the foci of the numbered aspects are substantively distinct, the perceptions of viewers may "lock-on" to one of the two aspects while ignoring the other. This can increase confusion when interpreting the data across the numbered aspects.

When writing numbered aspects, it is most important to remind oneself repeatedly that a viewer's perspective is like a camera. If the camera is well placed, the viewer's perspective will be well placed, and a great deal of useful data may be perceived. If the camera is poorly located, then the viewer's perspective may not produce as high a yield

of useful data. Examples of the use of numbered target aspects can be found in Brown 2006.

One final point. The publicity promoting all public demonstrations of remote viewing should point out that the tasker is volunteering his or her time in a personally generous manner. Any involvement with remote-viewing demonstrations should not be minimized. Lots of people still scoff at the idea of remote viewing as a real phenomenon. When a person of significant reputation volunteers to choose targets for a public demonstration, the person is giving the demonstration a significant degree of visibility and legitimacy. The public wants to watch public demonstrations when they involve people (especially taskers) whom they trust. The publicity surrounding the public demonstration of remote viewing should amply describe the tasker's credentials, as well as note the appreciable nature of the person's offer to contribute to the project.

References

Brown, Courtney. 2006. *Remote Viewing: The Science and Theory of Nonphysical Perception*. Atlanta, Georgia: Farsight Press.