

PJ Gaenir's Firedocs Remote Viewing Collection
RV Oasis Discussion Group Interview Series

Interview #002

Joseph W. McMoneagle

September / October 2002

Firedocs Remote Viewing:
<http://www.firedocs.com/remotereviewing/>

Joe McMoneagle's RV Website:
<http://www.mceagle.com/remote-viewing/>

RV Oasis [pjr] on the web:
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/pjr/>

Scroll to the next page for the interview details.

- Are there ***specific*** exercises in meditation, perception, etc. that are helpful to RV?
- How should training vs. research on 'who can RV' be interpreted by students?
- The best viewers have spent a lot of time practicing and it *seems* like one gets better.
- What were the most frustrating issues you dealt with in your viewing or development as a viewer?
- How do you feel about 'tasking ethics'?
- How much of 'psi talent' do you think is really a matter of psychology allowing/accepting psi?
- Do you still "practice" RV, outside of formally doing it?
- What would you say is the primary issue that most hinders the development of new viewers?
- There's been talk about subconscious "fear of psi" relating to the common decline-effect...
- How important do you think the role of the interviewer/monitor is in RV?
- How important do you consider the 'psi talent' of the monitor themselves to be?
- Describe the one session done by someone else that most impressed the hell out of you.
- Was RV Analysis – various approaches and details – studied during the STAR GATE research?
- Was there a difference in how the analysis for Ops sessions were done?
- What do you think about [remote influence]?
- Have you ever heard of the military trying dowsing or other psi outside of "RV"?
- How do you see an ARV time loop, and how do you view ARV "displacement"?
- Do you think it'd be useful to employ RV/ ARV to ask about how to improve RV methodologies?
- Do you think dowsing should be done as blind as RV?
- Are you a good hypnotic subject? How do you think hypnosis plays into RV ability?
- How do you relate RV, OBE's, and NDE's?
- How do you think lucid dreaming relates to waking reality, to RV, or to both?
- Do you believe that animals have 'sentience' –something that lives on after biological death?
- Have you ever tuned into a dolphin or whale? If so, what was your experience of them?
- Do you believe in Telekinesis? ... Any comments in general?
- What do you think about 'healing'?
- It seems like if healing is possible, then harm must be, by the same logic.
- ***The next section has personal email Q&A between Joe and PJ that he agreed to have added to this interview.***

Besides just practicing RV, and the list of suggestions you gave to RV Oasis (thanks!), are there specific exercises in meditation, perception, etc. that are helpful to RV?

Anything that opens up perception, defuses ego or the necessity to be right, anything that eliminates fear (of rejection, failure, topic matter, etc.) and anything that teaches mental discipline is important.

Look – you have to understand that this is the important part of RV, not the RV itself. It's what you learn about yourself, how you process or manipulate information, how you put the slant on it that you desire or don't desire, how you apply it to your reality, what constitutes good or bad focus and self-discipline.

The RV part is totally secondary and a by-product to all the other things you bring to the table. That's not where the actual focus should be. Focus instead on where your place in reality lies and why. What is your responsibility to reality and why?

Those selling RV training say most everyone who practices can become decent at RV (to varying degrees). Researchers say only a tiny % of people have the innate talent to be really good at RV. How should all this be interpreted by those practicing RV to improve their skill?

First, the researchers are correct, because they have tested for many years to determine that to be true. But, what does that have to do with one's personal belief? Because they say it, so what?

The point is that no one ever knows how good or how bad they are ever going to be at this thing called RV, until they put energy into it and find out. If I believed what half the people on the planet say about things, I probably would have skipped this lifetime altogether. The only person who knows is the person doing it.

Unfortunately, most do not invest the energy necessary to find out. They believe erroneously that they can pay a lot of money to someone who will teach them the "secret" to how it's done and that's all that's required. Wrong! There are no secrets. There's no one specific method that works better than any other.

I've talked about RV needing to be within a specific protocol to be called RV – that's true. Many will say this has no bearing on how good or how bad someone will be at RV. That too is wrong. In fact, the hardest person to convince that RV is real and works is called "self." If you leave one iota of doubt in your own mind that it is possible, you will never be good at it. You have to set up the circumstances that are the most difficult to beat and then when you succeed, you will understand more about RV than all the lessons in the world can teach you.

It doesn't work all the time for anyone, it isn't perfect all the time for anyone, it isn't nearly as accurate as many would tell you it is. The fact is, that it will work reasonably well for anyone who is able to convince themselves that it will - there are no other secrets.

Some scientists suggest as far as lab results go, even practicing over years doesn't make anybody better. Yet the best viewers have spent a lot of time practicing and it seems like one gets better. It is hard to make sense of research results when they seem to contradict hands-on experience. What do you say to this?

I practice in order to maintain my capacity to translate what I sense into usable information. The only way I've improved over time is in my reliability. I've not improved very much in accuracy.

One has to remember that there is always an expected improvement that takes place simply from understanding the rules. The research shows (that's testing under controls over long periods of time in a lab) that there is very little improvement over time in the quality of remote viewing (accuracy.)

Over time, many who do RV within applications scenarios begin to feel that the scientific controls get in the way of getting to the target. They are able to convince themselves that such draconian controls are no longer necessary – that they are able to differentiate between the right and wrong way to approach a target. This is called deluding oneself. Even scientists who study something in a lab over long periods of time sometimes fall prey to this self-delusion.

As one slowly moves away from the strict controls the remote viewing will improve, but only because other things come into play – neuro-linguistics, inappropriate leading, etc. People will make up excuses as to why this okay – we get information that seems to be correct anyway – right? Well in not too delicate terms, this is called cheating. All it does for someone trying to learn that remote viewing is possible is that it produces doubt in their mind. This makes what they are actually trying to do more difficult, to the point of significant failure at a latter date, when they try to accomplish the same accuracy and reliability under severe controls.

It's the reason a lot of self-proclaimed experts in RV won't do RV under those severe controls in public.

When you were practicing RV (as you described in your book *Mind Trek*), what were the most frustrating issues you dealt with in your viewing or development as a viewer?

Failure. I had to learn how to deal with failure. This means I also had to learn to deal with ego investment in the outcome.

How do you feel about 'tasking ethics'? Do you feel viewers should, as part of development, eventually view things that might include violence or death, sex or birth, or other potentially high-impact materials? Do you feel it's inappropriate to task such things to others, and/or to beginners or during training?

I think there are ethics that need to be followed in RV just like any other endeavor. Subjecting people to emotionally charged targets when you have no real idea of their stability or ability to deal with such subjects is unconscionable. Telling what color a target is provides sufficient difficulty to the beginning remote viewer.

Most don't want to spend the amount of time necessary to get a handle on what's going on in their mind, they want to get right to the "exciting" and "interesting" stuff. That's like asking someone who just learned to ride a bicycle to climb onto a Suzuki Hayabusa and hit the highway. All it will do is trash the rider and the bike and instill a great deal of fear about ever venturing out on two wheels again.

The targeting needs to be interesting, but all targeting is, if it is done within controls and someone is successful. It's the fault of the trainer if they can't make that a reality. In the military unit, Skip Atwater was able to do that, and that kept my interests alive.

How much of 'psi talent' do you think is really a matter of psychology allowing/accepting psi?

All of it. That comes from "knowing" it's real, not believing it to be so.

Do you still “practice” RV, outside of formally doing it? How much RV (overall) do you do a week – how much practice, how much tasked? What is your method of practice, what kind of targets/tasking?

Yes, I practice all the time. I probably do five or six targets a week. Between practiced and tasked it's probably about 1/3 practice and 2/3 tasked.

My practice targets are all photographic targets taken from a pool of targets developed for use within the Laboratories for Fundamental Research. Mixed in with those are other targets of greater interest that pop up once in awhile. I put enough of those in there to not know what or when they might occur.

All practice targets are always done under the strictest of controls and are always a total surprise to me. More so than the tasked, since I sometimes know who the Tasker is (this does not imply that I know what the target will be ahead of time. I never know this. I'm sometimes just not surprised at what it turns out to be based on who the Tasker is that is asking for it).

Outside of lack of proper practice (we know it should be consistent, double-blind, with feedback, for a long period of time, as you've said many times elsewhere), what would you say is the primary issue that most hinders the skill-development of the attempting-to-view aspirants you've encountered?

They try to do too much too quickly. They do the RV too quickly. They want the results too quickly. They go to the next target too quickly. They don't think about what they are going to do, what they are actually doing, or what happened after the fact. No real focus on what's going on.

They are doing it just “to get to being an expert ” faster. When they should be doing it to understand why they process a certain way. Where the information comes from in their own mind, why they deal with it the way they do, what's wrong with how they deal with it, etc.

There's been talk about subconscious “fear of psi” relating to the common decline-effect, and contributing to why so few end up ‘world-class’ remote viewers like yourself. What do you think? Is there really such culture-wide fear of psi? Do you think people realize they've got it? (Many viewers discussing it online say it's not a problem for them.) If you think this is an issue, how would you suggest viewers address dealing with this?

If someone says that this is not a problem for them - then I would say they have never communicated with their unconscious mind.

It's a major issue, and one that never goes away. It's a fear that's not just culture wide, it's pervasive in all cultures. Even those that have practitioners of PSI have fear of it. It speaks to the dark side for most. It's an uncomfortable window to things we “shouldn't have access to.”

There are no suggestions for dealing with it – since there is no way of truly conquering it. It's one more battle that's constantly waged in doing RV – a battle you sometimes win and sometimes don't.

How important do you think the role of the interviewer/monitor is in RV? And does it differ depending on psi method?

It's important in training, but not beyond that. I'm presuming here that someone has actually learned to RV.

If you seem to do really well with a monitor and don't seem to do well at all without one, then your monitor probably knew more about the target than they were sharing with you. There should be no substantial change in ability between working with or without a monitor. If there is, then you have cause to demand your money back.

How important do you consider the 'psi talent' of the monitor themselves to be? Can you (are you allowed to) name and/or at least tell us something about your 'favorite' monitor(s) out of those you've had over the last 25 years or so you've done formal RV?

If RV is being done appropriately – blind – then the monitor has the opportunity of being just as psychic as the remote viewer. Inevitably the monitor will usually ask exactly the right question at exactly the right time in an RV session if they are also blind. You might think of two psychics being better than one. Unfortunately, some monitors will suck at being psychic so this is not always the case.

In my work at SRI and SAIC my monitor most of the time was Dr. Nevin Lantz. He was as good a remote viewer in many cases as he was a monitor. I enjoyed working with him because he accepted the totally blind scenario as being helpful to the process and work accordingly. He understood the importance of having a strong expectation for a result and staying within the boundaries of the problem at hand. He trusted me to give him information that would be correct and never doubted that I could. This was important to me with regard to my capacity to perform.

In the military unit at Fort Meade, I had numerous monitors, but during training it was Skip Atwater and Mel Riley. They were both exceptionally good at it. They also understood how difficult it was to do the RV and their expectations were focused on supporting me in my effort.

I need to underscore however that I've had some terrible monitors in my time, some who were unabashedly non-believers in what they were participating in. Some were even hostile to RV.

A number of interviewers that presented targets to me while on camera for major Networks were openly hostile to the process. By then however, I was able to deal with their issues as well as my own and produce the needed result anyway.

Which is why I believe it is important to the learning but not the practicing of RV.

Describe the one session done by someone else that most impressed the hell out of you.

Captain Thomas McNear produced a clay model of an Aztec temple in a double-blind remote viewing exercise that was a nearly perfect example of the structure. Hartleigh Trent produced a near perfect drawing of a specific military device in double blind targeting at Fort Meade, Maryland. There are dozens of these examples that are very impressive, at least to me.

Was RV Analysis – various approaches and details – studied during the STAR GATE research? If so, can you tell us anything about it? (Is it declassified?)

Yes. I won't talk about them.

It's said you did Ops viewing even while you were on the research side of the STAR GATE project (after you had retired from the Army). Was there a difference in how the viewing was done in one area than another? Was there a difference in how the analysis for Ops sessions were done?

Yes I did. Yes there was. I am unable to talk about those differences.

There is a former star gate intell person who teaches RV methods, who claims to have done RI in the Unit, and teaches RI as well as RV. What do you think about all this? Did our gov't really task psychics in that project to psychically 'influence' (or harm) enemies?

I've never seen RI demonstrated under controls. I've seen it claimed by many.

I've witnessed synchronistic events, which give the appearance of occurring simultaneously with an attempt at RI, but which were later refuted. While I've seen the claims at RI heavily documented within the press or on-line, I've not seen the repudiation statements made very public.

There have been a number of claims of RI made by other countries, but those have yet to be replicated or substantiated. I have spoken to many who have made those claims and they have verified that they have not been replicated.

At this time I have to say that I do not believe RI to be real and won't until such proof and replication is forthcoming.

Have you ever heard of the military trying dowsing or other psi outside of "RV"? If so, what were the results, do you know? If they were reasonable, why didn't it "stick"?

Dowsing was used a lot in the unit actually. In fact, I was trained to dowse by a Ms. Francis Farelley while working at SRI-International – she was one of the best dowers in America at the time.

A platoon of Marines were trained to dowse for booby traps and tunnels in Vietnam and my understanding (based on what I read about the results) was they were able to demonstrate a significant reduction in wounded in action, and effectiveness in searches within NVA controlled villages.

Why it didn't stick is easy to ascertain – it wasn't institutionalized. In reviewing military history, one can find numerous areas where things are not institutionalized that work very well. Sniper units trained for WWI, WWII, and Korea were discontinued after each of those conflicts even though they were considered to be quite successful. They were probably discontinued because they were not viewed as morally acceptable (much like RV I suppose.) But, subsequent to Vietnam, they have been institutionalized.

Eventually, it is my hope that RV, dowsing, and other paranormal practices will be institutionalized at some time in the future. When, would be anyone's guess.

How do you see an ARV time loop, and how do you view ARV "displacement?" Why do you think it occurs?

The jury is still out on displacement. There may be no scientific validity to it. ARV is simply assigning a future result to a specific target outcome, and then trying to work backward for an answer. There is no time loop, because there is no such thing as time. There is connectivity between the target and the future result, but only by identification.

Do you think it'd be useful to employ RV/ ARV to ask about how to improve RV methodologies?

No. I don't believe there is a way to improve RV methodologies as they are equally about as bad one to another. The method isn't important – the protocol is.

The method is how one decides to deal with the information they are trying to pull out of their mind. Everyone is different - therefore every working method will be different to some degree. They are all flawed, just like we are and our modality of thinking.

Much dowsing is done with a full knowledge of the target, and/or knowledge of the terrain/options one is dowsing. Do you think dowsing should be done as blind as RV?

Yes and no. I believe that sometimes the information gets in the way of the result you are looking for. Like any other form of PSI performance, too much information up front spoils the outcome.

There are times however when a dowser need to see the terrain. You simply can't put a well in some places, so why even dowse there?

Are you a good hypnotic subject? How do you think hypnosis plays into RV ability?

No. Not when others are trying to hypnotize me. However, I can hypnotize myself to the point of feeling no pain, or doing things I wouldn't normally be able to do.

How do you relate RV, OBE's, and NDE's? Do you think there is some subtle energy body involved in RV that is not perceptible to the viewers?

That's always a possibility. At the moment, I'm not buying that, however.

I think in RV we are dealing solely with information. That is also the possibility with OBE's as well as NDE's. Since there is no demonstrated physical interaction with a remote location vis-à-vis OBE's or NDE's, at least one that's provable, that will also have to remain an open question.

I believe we have a tendency to jump to conclusions about energy states because they present the easiest answer to the conundrum, but there could be a multitude of other possibilities we have not yet conjectured. I'd rather keep my mind open to those not yet extent possibilities.

How do you think lucid dreaming relates to waking reality, to RV, or to both?

About the same as NDE's or OBE's. Dr. Steven LaBerge, who has researched lucid dream states now for probably 30 years, told me that all states are possible lucid dream states – even what we term waking consciousness. In the sense that waking consciousness is a state of mind, he could be correct. One more reason to believe that time/space is manufactured.

I'm not sure it is as important at the moment to understand the individual "states" as it is to understand the differences between them.

At the moment it is impossible for scientists, or anyone for that matter, to tell one state from the next unless they have experienced them all, and even then they are subjectively reported.

Do you believe that animals have 'sentience' – thoughts, something that lives on after biological death? What about trees and plants? What about supposedly inanimate things like gems and stones, or the earth itself?

Yes to all the above. They exist at the very least as mental or thought form creations as real as when they are experienced. When we cease to be, our intellects appear to carry on, so then must the intellect thought forms. Do they have thought forms of their own? That is an interesting question and one that I believe to be true, although that is instinctive and difficult to prove otherwise.

Have you ever tuned into a dolphin or whale? If so, what was your experience of them?

Yes. While stationed in Eleuthera in the Bahamas I developed a relationship in the wild with a male dolphin and his pod (a female and two dependents.) My sense was that they were conscious and had a lot more intellectual sensibility than we would normally allow to such a species.

The male was very protective of me while I was in his territory, and very respectful of my belongings. He was also brutally dominant to the female, which dispelled any desire I might have had to class them as a purely loving and innocent species. They appeared to have their own cultural distinctiveness, which is different from our own.

I believe they are an intelligent species, but I also believe we project a lot of inaccurate belief onto them relative to what they might be in relationship to us.

Do you believe in Telekinesis? Have you tried it, and to what extent? If so, what kind of experiences have you had with it? Has it ever happened spontaneously (and if so in what way)? Any comments in general?

There are lots of rumors running rampant about telekinesis, but to my knowledge, I have never seen it demonstrated within a lab anywhere on the planet.

The Chinese make claims of being able to do it with young children, and I've seen the tapes, but they are heavily cut and edited so highly questionable.

I've met people over the years that have experienced losing something by having it disappear right in front of them – that's happened to me as well. Where does an object like a pencil, pen, paperclip, quarter, that sort of thing go when it disappears is beyond my ken.

In terms of seeing something appear – well, again there are lots of stories about that. Some of the incidents, which were filmed were quite convincing to those doing the observing but on analyzing the films later frame by frame, you can clearly see slight of hand. Usually the things that appear and disappear are small enough to hide within the hand or palm which again raises some difficult questions around the entire subject.

I personally think that there are items that sort of morph in and out of real-time space, but so far it hasn't been accomplished on demand while under controls. Until that time, well...it's still going to be questionable.

What do you think about 'healing'? If we applied the concepts of creating one's own reality and probabilities to the subject of healing, it would make it seem like nobody could heal anybody else without the targeted person's permission and even active agreement on some level. What do you think about that? Might part of healing be an innate talent for 'influencing' others to 'accept' it?

It would take an entire book to properly answer this question, even in the short form.

I'll just cut to the quick.

Healing deals with belief. If you want to heal someone – they had better be agreeable to it or it probably won't work. I've never seen anyone healed that wasn't open to the possibility first.

There are times when someone is healed with no pre-proscribed belief that it was possible, but then there are times when spontaneous healing does take place. Until someone figures out a way to separate out the spontaneous effects from the deliberate – it will remain a matter of belief.

Given all this is true, I do not believe that someone can exercise their will over another person (as in remote influencing), unless the person influenced has agreed to it in some formal way. Note: I did not say *consciously* agreed to it. I suspect that one can sit down with another human being and encourage them to believe they can be remote influenced and that may create the effect, when in fact, they brought themselves to believe it could be done, thereby giving permission for the effect to occur.

To date, I have not seen remote influencing against someone's will within an approved protocol.

As you might imagine, the topic of 'remote influence' is popular on the Internet. Do you think this is possible? It seems like if healing is possible, then harm must be, by the same logic.

In concert with the above response, no – I do not think that it has ever been demonstrated, unless the person influenced has agreed to that belief in the first place. In such a case, it may be possible because the person has essentially given permission to be manipulated in some way – subtle or otherwise.

If "psychic rapport" is possible then Remote Influencing (RI) seems a logical possibility. But if we are all part of 'one' and connected, then technically, don't our lousy thoughts vs. loving thoughts about others affect them a bit as well? How would one philosophically separate lousy intent toward another vs. a 'session' to generate lousy intent?

I'm not sure I follow this logic. Psychic rapport (which is extremely rare by the way) is always between two or more consenting entities. I say entities because I think we see it going on in the way that birds fly, or fish move in water, that sort of thing.

There is, however, no logical jump to a belief that even agreeing to participate in psychic rapport opens one up to "lousy intent" as you call it. We are extent within our own universe – we do not share in another's universe unless they either share something with us – overtly through action, and this action can be both implied or real; or, there can be some tacit agreement to co-participate with someone else in some non-overt way.

Where I think the whole idea is actually birthed out of a judgment that we might make about someone else's actions. We don't just see someone doing something that is a simple act - we see it in the guise of "good and bad" and try to re-connect it somehow to an event that is "good or bad" that might be happening in our lives or someone else's life. It's our way of dealing with good or bad things that we experience, but for which we can find no cause.

{PJ Gaenir asked Joe for permission to include a little bit of their personal correspondence from July-August 2002 into this interview, excerpts which covered topics that had been on the RV Oasis discussion list. Joe agreed, and it follows.}

[pj] Sometimes it seems like the RV field is just stagnant. Same people, same old stories we've heard 1001 times. Same people raking in thousands per student to 'teach' them RV, but still no surplus of many competent viewers despite all those trained. No movement...

[Joe] I see what you mean, but that's because people who want to learn to RV still look to others as having some kind of a secret they don't possess. All it requires is hard work and talent. The fact that everyone becomes frustrated at not being a world-class psychic doesn't surprise me. But few ever seem

to hear the part about talent/ practice/ rules, which translates into hard work, hard work, and then more hard work – done properly – for a considerable amount of time.

[pj] What I see in the field is, it's demoralizing for developing viewers when they don't see opportunities for using RV, for doing something meaningful with it. It seems like a waste of something invaluable to RV pictures for eternity. Granted, the world doesn't much support legitimate psi functioning. But there must be *something*.

Do you think it's hopeless to focus on providing an "opportunity" for viewers to DO something with RV?

[joe] Nothing's hopeless. Not all things have easy answers either.

Where's the curiosity for what goes on in RV, how it might work, why information gets transferred? I hear a lot about doing things with it that are meaningful. But I've not heard much about, "What makes it tick?" That's the part that keeps me going. I want to know "why?" "How?" "Because...?"

In my quest for those things, I've gotten better and people hunt me down to do things for them. Those things sometimes work. I attempt to display it within appropriate rules to the public.

Much of the public doesn't seem to grasp the fact that there are rules—they just want to be psychic like me, and figure there must be some trick, some magic that I'm not sharing.

I think if people can't find the reason for pursuing it within themselves (their need to develop in that way), as opposed to the reason being outside them (what they'll "do" with it), they should find something else to pursue.

[pj] A number of former intelligence viewers say things like, ethically one should not view another individual unless tasked by some formal authority for it. That's easy to say, though. It translates in the real world to, "*Nobody can do serious Ops RV but those of us who did it in the past, so have clearances, unless it's "corporate" work (and good luck finding much of that, haha!). Though of course, you can view photos 'till you puke.*"

[joe] I don't think that says that at all. What I've always said was that it was unethical in *a lot of* cases. So, one has to determine where their own ethics lie.

An argument can be made for good morality versus bad morality and some would think, thereby establish within the ethics of viewing something that would otherwise be protected under the Constitution. That's a violation of the Constitution – moral or not, justified or not.

So there are no mistakes in what I'm saying, you need to understand that the remote viewing, which I've always done within the military unit or with the lab was "always" within the ethical boundaries of the Constitution.

I was either going after known felons, supporting US Government directed action of ethical nature, or searching for missing kids under the age of 18 at the request of their parents, the police, etc.

I have upset plenty of people over time by refusing to do remote viewing even when directed to by authorities, when I felt it was unethical to do so or a violation of law. This especially happens when someone from an agency decides to use RV only as an excuse to obtain and insert information into a problem they would have had no legal access to in the first place.

I reiterate, this is unethical and I would advise against it in or out of a classified scenario. All of these rules also hold true just as well with regard to the corporate world.

[pj] I think I should be able to view any damn thing I want... but what I do with the information (or even admit to viewing) is where the ethics issue comes in. And of course, it just isn't interesting to me to invade people's privacy for no good reason, so "any damn thing I want" in my case is probably more conservative than people who think they have a Big Case Of Ethics about it all.

[joe] Which is essentially what I said above. Also, there are times when a person's ethical and moral viewpoint might run counter to the law. I'm not telling someone to violate their own feelings about what's right to be within the law. There are times when it is righteous to go against the law or society and one has to be ready to fall on the sword or take whatever repercussions come from violating it.

Your example [previously] of people who kill seals – well, I might just violate their rights to prevent it from happening. It would depend on how I might feel at the time. What you do and can live with is different from what others do and can live with. I never hold anyone to an ethical or moral standard I am not willing to follow or stick to myself.

[pj] An excerpt recently posted on the list from one of your books suggests that viewers should follow all legal dictates. Of course that would mean, I could NOT view a person who might be illegally killing seals or dumping toxic waste, because the police didn't task me. Not that the police would know there was an issue if I did NOT view this and make evidence possible. And not that the police would use a viewer anyway!

[joe] That is correct. You would be violating the law. Now show me someone with integrity who has never violated the law or who will not violate the law if required by their own ethical or moral values.

The point is, once you've made that decision, you need to be willing to accept the consequences as well. If I jump a guy who's going to kill a seal, I will be arrested for assault. I have to be willing to go down for the assault to save the seal. Simple.

[pj] Technically the more psychic one is, the less "division" there would be between knowledge one just 'has' and knowledge one gets 'in session'. I assume. That makes it more difficult to address the issue of what one can 'ethically' view.

[joe] That would be correct. One of the major rules a remote viewer has to learn is when NOT TO SPEAK or share information they've gained access to. It's as much a problem of when to speak as when not to speak. I suppose now there will be expert remote viewers popping up in culture who never speak because it's against their ethics (this is in humor by the way).

In my history with remote viewing, my focus has been on Ethics, the righteousness in how or when it's used, never overselling or underselling it, trying not to denigrate others involved in it (except in the extremes), and admitting failures and walking away from them with a smile on my face no matter how bad I might feel inside.

All those things, I do not for my own sake (although ultimately it is also for my reputation...), but because I understand that it isn't what's happening today that will judge RV or make something of it. It's the hindsight evaluation, which will be done 50, 100, or 200 years from now that will have the most effect on it.

We make history by what we do – so when we do whatever we are doing, we should do it with a responsibility towards the evolution of that history – it's called leading by example.

There's a story about a 17-year old Marine on Tarawa during the Second World War. He's in a foxhole with another man who's firing a BAR (Browning Automatic Rifle). They are part of the Raiders of the Marine 1st Division, and their foxhole is way out in front of the defensive line – one of two forks on a two-pronged fork. They are being assaulted over and over again, and as the Japanese get closer they start throwing grenades. If one goes off in the hole, their defensive position is destroyed. So, the guy who isn't firing the Bar says to his buddy – *any grenade that lands in the hole is mine. Your job is to keep firing the Automatic Rifle.* Grenade after grenade lands in the hole and he keeps pitching them back until he picks up one and realizes he hasn't got any time to get rid of it. So, he slams his body against it, pinning it to the side of the hole and is killed. But his buddy keeps firing the BAR. The Japanese never overrun the hole and they are eventually pushed back. It's the single selfless act of a 17 year old that understands that history is being made in that scummy hole in the middle of the Pacific Ocean and he takes the responsibility on as though it was always meant to be.

That story is in every book ever written about Tarawa. The guy's name was Harry Gurke (Harry the Pickle) He was a second generation German, and received the Medal of Honor for it. The man firing the BAR was a first generation German – PFC Donald Probst. Both were fighting for the survival of a country that mistreated their own parents during the war – a result of their genealogy.

These guys understood that they carried a responsibility toward humanity that outweighed themselves. Their example has probably been emulated more than two dozen times in wars since. And we get to do whatever we want with our own lives as a result. We exercise the freedoms people like them guaranteed with their blood, even the right to argue and demonstrate against war as stupid.

I can't help but wonder where we'd be today if those average kinds of guys were not capable of recognizing their larger responsibility in their own place and time.

[pj] I'm coming to believe that real 'target contact' is a much bigger issue than anything else (method, etc.).

[joe] It is. It has more to do with how real you are.

[pj] There's a viewer who uses a precog method she calls 'wildcards'. Essentially, the sessions are done with the target being 'whatever gets assigned to this session later'. I've had good results for a long time with a similar approach in practice. Seems logical that it'd be handy to have the viewing for a problem already done when a call comes in! Do you think this is okay for tasking practice as well as Ops?

[joe] The tasking is fine. By the way, John Petersen runs The Arlington Institute, which is a futurist think tank in Arlington, Virginia, just across the Potomac from DC. He wrote a book about it, which came out sometime back around 1994. He specifically invented the term "Wildcards" within that same meaning. He calls them precursors to events that more times than not, change history.

[pj] Why is Associative Remote viewing (ARV) allegedly so hard for viewers to do well on consistently? Do you think it's the "probable nature" of reality? I theorize that combines with psychological issues that are magnified by the nature of ARV. If a person didn't know it was ARV/precog, would they do better?

[joe] Assuming you are speaking of Associative Remote Viewing, as it was *intended* to be used? If so, it isn't hard to do consistently. All that's required is a very general gestalt to do the judging, and there are never more than a handful of pictures to judge against.

So, I have to say that consistency in ARV is *not* difficult – it's actually easier than in regular RV. What's difficult about that?

[pj] I've been wondering why so much RV data is 'symbolic'. Maybe all data is symbolic and it's just that we recognize a subset of symbols as 'consensus reality'.

[joe] I believe the information (relative to our current world) is passed to the conscious mind from the unconscious. The unconscious has always spoken to us in symbols because it has no language of its own. It has to borrow symbols from the conscious mind and looks for and uses those that most closely resemble what it is trying to communicate.

If the target contains the sewage processing plant, and you are someone who has never seen a sewage processing plant, there are no examples in current memory to borrow from, so it invents the next best thing – an in-ground swimming pool perhaps, and mixes that with an impression of something perhaps not quite smelling right. Hopefully the logic is pure enough (which it usually is) to result in enough collective details to lead to a conclusion of a sewage plant.

The problem with most people is multifold;

- a) Most don't wait long enough for enough information to collect before they've already jumped to a conclusion,
- b) They never pay attention to how they normally process information, so they don't recognize the processing going on, or
- c) They don't believe they have access to the information in the first place.

[pj] OK. Do you have any secret cache of protégés I don't know about who will pop up 10 minutes after your demise to claim lineage?

[joe] Absolutely not! Although, I'm sure that someone will claim that. I do not – you heard it here – so if that happens, you can reproduce this statement. Better yet, tell anyone making that claim I will ensure their lack of success from the other side.

[end]

This interview #002 is second in a series of three.

PJ Gaenir and the RV Oasis [pjr] Discussion Group of September/October 2002 would like to thank Mr. Joseph McMoneagle for his time and his courtesy.

This contents of this document are Copyright © 2002 by PJ Gaenir as part of the Firedocs Remote Viewing Collection, and to Joseph and Nancy McMoneagle. All rights reserved. Excerpts from this interview should only be 'paraphrased' unless formal written permission is requested and given for replication of content.