

Interview with Courtney Brown, Ph.D.
Author: Cosmic Explorers Scientific Remote viewing,
Extraterrestrials, and a Message for mankind

By Paola Harris - April 17, 2000



Courtney Brown, Ph.D.

Harris: Do you mind if I tape this so I don't make mistakes? I'm taping this with a regular tape with a telephone system here in Rome.

Brown: yeah, Okay

Harris: Okay

Brown: Thank you very much for asking for this interview. I saw your web site and it was very interesting.

Harris: The people in Italy found out that I had worked with Dr. J Allen Hyneck in the '80's and they started asking me to do UFO research and so that's how I got involved.

Brown: That's an exciting field for you to be in. That's great.

Harris: Well , Let me explain your book was given to me about a month ago because I'm really interested in remote viewing. I had been interested in Ingo Swann when he came out with his web site and his book Penetration and I thought, how come all of a sudden this work which I thought was top secret government project becomes public and people can talk about it?

Brown: Yeah, well there are actually two sides to it. Ingo's stuff is very, very up front. I don't see any remote possibility for him to deceive anyone for any reason. You know, he states that he's tried to clear up things on record as he's getting older, and he wants to get on with other things. I can't see any reason, or at least any profit motivation, for selling Penetration. The first seventy pages is riveting. I don't think he intended to write a spellbinder or anything like that. So I find him very credible. I, by the way, don't know Ingo. I've only spoken to him once for five minutes on the phone. We've exchanged only one letter, and I wish I had been able to know him better. So if I say anything dealing

with Ingo, it's only third hand information, but it's always great, great positive stuff. I wish I'd known him.

Harris: You never worked with Ingo . Did you ever work with Hal Putoff at the Stanford Research Institute, or any of those people?

Brown: No, we have our own institute here, The Farsight Institute

Harris: Right

Brown: They have an interesting story, but they have a lot of legacy stuff goes back to the seventies and eighties.

Harris: So did you develop The Farsighted Institute?

Brown: I developed Farsight Institute. What happened was that SRI International, which used to be Stanford Research, part of Stanford University, well, they were contracted by the government to research remote viewing. Apparently, the luminaries in the field are very up front about the CIA's involvement in terms of the funding, but also there was the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) as well. The DIA is the intelligence wing of the Pentagon. And that more recently has become very up front. The Defense Intelligence Agency of the Pentagon really had operational purposes for this. It was a very new phenomenon. The government wanted to know how to use it for espionage purposes right away, and the scientific illuminaries such Russell Targ and Hal Putoff wanted to do basic science. I mean, you just can't get something like this and throw it immediately into operation.

Harris: I know

Brown: What the mechanism is, how it works, can it be reliable, what's going on? And so they were always under tremendous time pressure and funding for sure. I get this from published sources.

Harris: Well, I know Hal Putoff, and I just did another interview with Paul Smith. I don't know if you know Paul Smith.

Brown: Of course he's one of the people I know of very well, but I do not know him personally.

Harris: Okay. These people talk about the original Stanford Research Institute

Brown: And so this is the legacy of this whole thing that the Stanford group started, how the first initial investigation started, under tremendous financial stress and personal pressure, because the government always wanted results within months. They wanted operational information out of it, and so it's sort of a two-edged sword. They tried to get as much basic science out of it as they could, given the fact that their funding was going to run out soon unless they did get some practical stuff out of it. So they had some remote viewing scenarios which were very successful in getting target information, and then the U.S. government worked with those people, back and forth. But with these results, the U.S. Army came into it strongly. That's where the DIA came in. They developed a remote viewing squad that was trained in techniques that Ingo Swann predominately developed, new methods of accessing this information, and when the US Army came into it, Paul Smith was part of that. There was another Special Forces (again, U.S. Army) remote viewing group as well that worked with a different noted psychic, Dr. Richard Ireland. He trained Glenn Wheaton who now runs the Hawaiian Remote Viewer's Guild (www.hrvg.org), and their very effective methods are much different from the Ingo Swan derived methods.

Harris: Right, right.

Brown: And it goes on and on

Harris: But your involvement ? Was it military work? Can you talk about that?

Brown: I'll get to me in just a second. But anyway, what happened was, after a while, the US Army, the Pentagon, realized that the information about remote viewing was going to become open.. They allowed a few of these people to go out and teach it. This is information that was told to me by two of those who were in the original RV/DIA unit. There's a lot of information that goes back and forth that eventually gets back to me. So what happened was that the government really wanted the remote viewing stuff to stay in the new age community, and to stay out of the mainstream. Now I'm not putting down the new age community. That's how the government saw it. As they saw it, in the new age community RV would hang around in new age book stores and healing and metaphysical places and coffee shops, all these non-mainstream places. That's not how I view these people, but that's what the government wanted. They wanted it to stay out of mainstream science where it might get the funding, and possibly get a lot of attention.

Harris: Now I need to ask you a question right in here, because this is where I have all my biggest arguments. If they wanted it to stay there, why would they fund something they don't consider science?

Brown: No that's not true, they have funded it all through out, even now. They do two things. They say they don't fund it but they do fund it.

Harris: But it is science, isn't it?

Brown: Yeah. It is science. We are strictly a scientific institute.

Harris: Yeah, I understand . I always believed this was scientific, but I have problems with the people that put it in the goofy new age category.

Brown: The whole idea was to put it in there and then never let it get out very far. Now I have been told this by people formerly in the military, actual people sitting in front of me talking. I won't tell the names of those people. I don't want to get into it; they didn't want their names published. Point blank, they were told by their upper ups, that the remote viewing stuff could only be let out only so much, anything beyond that would be shut down, and nothing would stop them (the DIA) from shutting it down. There would be no holds barred. It would be all oriented around disinformation . They knew it was going to get out, but they thought they could control it better if it was out and it was laughed at, or at least marginalized, rather than if I got out and was taken seriously because you really don't need too many experiments before you realize it's real. So they had to make people afraid to do the experiments that would put most scientists on guard because they don't want to risk their reputations. So the big money won't go after it.

So, really what happened is that remote viewing is very real, but it's still very marginal in the scientific community. So what happened was that these Army guys went out to teach, and I'd made friends with two of them, and one in particular. I paid cash to learn and to be professional at it. But I looked at it from an academic's point of view.

Harris: Are you still working at Emory University?

Brown: You can always get my whole academic and professional background at www.courtneybrown.com

Harris: Okay and you're still at Emory University right?

Brown: Yeah, but when I'm at Emory, I do nothing related to The Farsight Institute or remote viewing

Harris: Okay, no. I just needed it for the article. You're still a professor?

Brown: Yep. Again, you can get all that information publicly and everything, all my published books, my Vitae, my academic books, and lots of other stuff, on my own personal web site: www.courtneybrown.com

Harris: Have you had problems at all like Harvard professor John Mack and other people with this material?

Brown: The president of Emory University is very very good. He understands that these things are separate, and that the scientific community has not yet put the stamp of approval of what I do. He understands that it's separate, and people are allowed to pursue their separate ideas as long as I don't do it in my political science classes. It's separate. It has nothing to do with what I do at The Farsight Institute. What I do at Emory University is teach political science. So anyway, what basically happened is that I originally learned the Ingo Swan version of RV from one of these ex-military guys, then we departed company and I founded my own institute. We've trained over one hundred seventy five people to do remote viewing. I re-did the RV protocols from my own "professor of science" perspective. I realized this stuff (as it was coming out of the Army) was very operationally oriented rather than science oriented, and so I changed it. I modified it. I adapted it. It wasn't just me, we had all of our researchers doing it. But our own procedures clearly evolved from Ingo Swann's procedures. They have a historical connection to them. And if you look them over, you can see how they evolved from the Swann procedures. But we have evolved our own procedures and vocabulary/language for it. We also publish our own web site, www.farsight.org, which has a huge library of free stuff. We are formally a IRS non-profit research and educational institute and we do only basic science in remote viewing. We publish our basic science on our web site.

Harris: I know. I noticed you have tapes to learn these procedures but do you have classes to where people can attend?

Brown: We don't have classes, at least right now. But we still teach lots of people RV, as I will explain. We formerly taught a whole bunch of people in personalized classes here in Atlanta. Like any college or university, we did not do this for profit. But it was taking too much of our time. We could not get our research done. We were interested (just like Putoff and everybody else) in doing basic science research. So we decided to stop teaching and for a year and a half, we just didn't do any teaching. But so many people asked us about training that we decided to come out with a large free downloadable audio course (plus a free printable text) that was just perfect with nothing omitted, and we have been giving it away freely to visitors to our web site. But we really have a very active research agenda. We have some real advances that we've discovered, problems that have been around for a couple of decades, and we're right now in the process of writing them up, getting them out, getting them published. And that's what we're really focusing on. There have been some problems that have plagued people doing research for a long long time.

Harris: Do you want to go into any of them?

Brown: Towards the end of the original SRI days, Ed May and those at SRI used a method for evaluating this remote viewing process which was supposed to be scientific that went like this: You have a remote viewer view a target "blind," in the sense that they're not supposed to know anything about it in advance. Then the RV data are given to a panel of judges who compare the data to a list of, say, five targets, one real and the others decoys or false targets. They're not told anything about what the correct target is, of course. They are given all the possible targets to try to figure out which one it would most likely be. Basically, they would say things like, "Okay that's clearly a sketch of the Empire State Building and it's certainly not a sketch of a desert." In situations in which they would be dealing with a number of possible targets on a shelf, they might observe that the RV data really looks like a vase and not a pen, or a cup, or plate. They would have five, say, different possible targets. So,

they would be trying to remote view one target out of the list and then they would take the RV data and try to determine which was the correct target.

And the problem was that while sometimes they would get the correct results, other times they get results in which very nice picture would show up, or a nice bit of descriptive information of one of the targets on the list, but it was the wrong target. It was very clear that the description wasn't of the correct target, but it was a description of one of the possible targets. It was correctly describing one of the targets but the wrong one, meaning that target wasn't the one that was picked by the random throw of the dice, or whatever.

Harris: That wasn't the one that was actually given to the person?

Brown: These targets were chosen dynamically, meaning some event like throwing dice or something else was done to determine which target was actually going to be used. So the instructions to the viewer would be to remote view the correct one.

Harris: But wouldn't he be given the coordinates?

Brown: Well, sometimes they'd be given coordinates but that's another aspect of the whole process. We don't need to be getting into technicalities. The basic idea was that they would be told there was a target and there would be a set of procedures they would be using to do this. Thus, a viewer would be told to describe the target. And let's say the possible targets were a plate, a cup, a pen, and a basketball. Well, the person would say the target is a pen, and then the random procedure would decide the correct target. The correct target was the plate but the description was of the pen and so the blind judges would say this person is describing the pen. But really, which was the correct one? What actually makes one target the correct one and the other targets incorrect? Does the randomization procedure really do this?

Harris: The plate.

Brown: The plate, but this person is describing a pen. So the pen is chosen as the correct target. And low and behold, it turns out that the random procedure picked the plate instead. But, you know the viewer had no idea that the pen was one of the targets when the viewing was done. I mean the person giving the instructions just says there is a target, and so the remote viewer would just describe one of the targets, and they had no idea which kind of target would be there. But they would end up describing one of the five targets. So the real question was how could a person accurately describe one of the wrong targets? What make a target a target? Is it because a random number procedure picked that spot on the shelf and said it was correct? Or is there some other process at work? So we spent two years investigating this problem. We first duplicated all SRI and SAIC (Science Applications International Corporation) results. And we found that indeed there was a problem. When you have targets on a list, you often get very good results of the wrong target. Very good results. Everything is correct. But it's not the one you want to get.

Harris: Okay I was going to ask you that. At least it was a scientific exploration.

Brown: Ed May moved the program to SAIC when he was the last director at SRI. He moved the program from SRI when they closed down the lab. So we invested two years looking into that research and we have research under review right now which we think resolves the issue. We really think we understand the issue.

Harris: I liked your first book.

Brown: Actually, Cosmic Explorers is my second book. It reports my own personal application of remote viewing. It's also in paperback now, originally published by Penguin Putnam. It is a much different book than Cosmic Voyage, my first remote viewing book. It's more recent, and it has a

hundred pages of methodology in it describing the remote viewing procedures used at Farsight. It also has updates in the sense that it continues the information presented in Cosmic Voyage. But it's a better book because every book I write is better than the one I did before.

Harris: No, I understand and I know here you're coming from but we're at ground zero here with remote viewing. Nobody ever considered remote viewing scientific or valid. I've been fighting to get my article published on remote viewing in two Italian magazines with the possible titles "Government Remote Viewers: The Psychic Connection." Well, the response from the editors is "this isn't science." Well, I said "if it isn't science, why is the government funding it?"

Brown: Well, the best place to get any information on remote viewing right now is our web site www.farsight.org. There's no place you can get more, and it is all free. The information is not necessarily about the history of it, but about the science and mechanics of it. Have you had a chance to look at it?

Harris: I went over your web site this morning.

Brown: Now if you go to the resources section you'll find SRV Learning Area. That has the free downloadable audio course, a printable text of Scientific Remote Viewing. The audio course and text have all the procedures. They're pretty clear. you don't have to pay a dime, and you don't have to buy tapes or anything like that. Everything at www.farsight.org is free.

Harris: Now I've got to ask you an obvious question, Courtney. I really think, and this isn't just my feeling but don't people have to have the ability before hand to be as good as you are now, a little bit of intuitive ability? There must be some way of testing those who are more prone to be a good remote viewers. Is that true?

Brown: We haven't found any limitations like that. What we have found is it really takes a lot of hard work and determination, persistence. Just like playing the violin. I mean if you play it, you'll make squeaky sounds at the beginning, but if you keep at it you'll eventually get it.

Harris: Yeah, but there's some better people who play the violin, the people who take lessons...

Brown: I understand. There is a level of talent.

Harris: And do you have that? Or did you have that, I want to ask you on a personal level.

Brown: Well, people have said I have that. All of the stuff I've published so that people can make their own judgments. We don't know the limits of the training process right now. People often take a few classes and then try to evaluate themselves. But we really don't know how far you can push this. So, people look at my work and say, that's what I do, and they see all this stuff published on the web and say "Oh, you must be just really gifted at this." But the reality is I work hard at this, and I deeply feel that others can be as good or better than me.

Harris: Oh, I realize that you work hard at it.

Brown: But I remote view a lot, meaning a number of times a week.

Harris: Okay, so do you do it with other people? You use monitors, right?

Brown: No, no we don't. None of us at the institute use monitors anymore. We just do solo sessions.

Harris: You don't use monitors?

Brown: Monitors are good for training. That's when Cosmic Voyage was written. When I was still a

baby at this stuff. Cosmic Explorers is also all solo stuff . And all the stuff we have on our web site is also solo stuff. All of us just do solo stuff now. And we have gotten to the point where we don't like monitors. There are some very good reasons for using monitors for research, but those are very commonly encountered. When you're good enough you can just do solo stuff. Again, we have an entire manual available for free, which is extensive. It's like a hundred pages of material. We have a library of remote-viewing sessions that people can look over, and we even also have the Real Audio so you can listen to some sessions recorded live. For example in my area of the Institute's web site, found from the Resources area of the web site, there are three of those recorded sessions. We've recorded them live so you can actually hear what was going on in the room. You can actually hear words spoken. Also, for six months we carried on a public demonstration on remote viewing, which you can also see on the web site. We had a tenured Associate Professor of medicine at George Washington University, Dr. John David Berman, pick the targets for us. He's head of their ethics committee. The really interesting thing about it was that we did "time" experiments for the demonstration. We would do the sessions first and then put typed and encrypted transcripts of them for people to download from our web site. You needed a password to remove the encryption. Lots of people downloaded them onto their computers. And while they were downloading them for a week or two, John would, he likes to be called David, then decide on the target that was he was going to choose. Again, the sessions were already done in the past. And he would say, OK I've decided the target is, let's say, "the Eiffel Tower." Actually, for one of the targets in the public demonstration he said the target is the Eiffel Tower when it was being constructed. So that would be the target and he would then send us the target via email. Then we would post the password to unravel the transcripts and everyone would see how well we did.

Harris: Well, when he sent you the target, how did he send it to you? I mean, did he send you the word.

Brown: No not just a word. He would actually just e-mail us that the target is the Eiffel Tower, plus other aspects of the target, like the time.

Harris: But you know the reason why I asked you about the Eiffel Tower that I just read the first book and there are only numbers for the target and there's only coordinates.

Brown: Well, the target coordinates. Well sometimes we do use target coordinates and I explain all of that in Cosmic Explorers. But they're only an aid, a crutch for the remote viewer to get started with. Those aren't essential. The person who writes the target doesn't need to know those.

Harris: Okay I'm trying to understand this, so what now?

Brown: So let me go back a little bit, you will understand it. We do the sessions first before the target has been determined. We post the session, typed and encrypted transcripts of those sessions, which has been encrypted with PGP, which is a publicly available encryption program.

Harris: Okay, go ahead.

Brown: We post the typed and encrypted transcripts up on the web so that anyone can download them. And so then they have copy of what the transcripts are so they know we can't change them afterwards. Then we need a target. Only then does John David Berman pick a target for us. He can't see the transcripts either because they're encrypted.

Harris: He picks the target after you've already done the remote viewing?

Brown: That's exactly it. See we're a scientific institute. We were doing "time experiments".

Harris: Can I play this back to you so I don't get confused? Okay so in other words you're doing the remote viewing before you ask somebody to pick a target but you've already done it because you're

going into the future. Are you going into the future? If so, we've got some serious problems with time here!

Brown: I'm actually collaborating currently with a physicist, a retired physicist from a major research university, and he has been very clear with all of this. Physicists do not understand time right now. No one really does.

Harris: Courtney, I have to ask you some questions because this is just for my own personal benefit. Okay, you went ahead and did this remote viewing, and after that you asked this gentleman to pick a target.

Brown: All this information is still up on the web site, you can go to it and follow everything exactly as it happened.

Harris: I have a million questions here. So when the gentleman then gave you the target, for the most part, was it usually accurate?

Brown: Well, now let me see. We completed 13 experiments with that six-month demonstration. I'll talk about my results: there was only one time out of thirteen that I didn't describe fairly well what was there. Often the results were exceptionally clear.

Harris: Oh my God. So you RV something that he had not chosen yet? I have been trying to figure this out for myself.

Brown: The thing is, most people would be confused. All you need to do is go to our web site. You can actually click on every experiment. Start with the most recent and go back.

Harris: Where is it?

Brown: If you go to the home page you'll see this. On the home page there is a big graphic of a hurricane, and a person's face, the Parthenon, the U.S. capital building, and so on. And down in the lower left you can see the public demonstration. It's there. Click there and then you will get to a page that has all the stuff for the public demonstration. You get to see the whole thing for all 13 experiments.

Harris: So how many people were doing this? You were doing it and how many others?

Brown: We had two viewers for each experiment. All experiments that we put up followed exactly the same format: two viewers using Dr. John David Berman (the medical professor) who would pick the target after the sessions were posted in encrypted format.

Harris: That's incredible...

Brown: We would then post the passwords to de-encrypt the transcripts together with the scans of the sessions after Dr. Berryman chose the target. If we didn't have the transcripts available in advance so that people could download them and later de-encrypt them on their hard drive, then they would have said "Oh, they faked the sessions." But having the transcripts stored in advance is very convincing.

Harris: I know what you're telling me, but it's just unbelievable.

Brown: What happened was when we put up the scans of the sessions, you then compare the sessions with the transcripts. And then people would say, "Oh lord, my gosh. This is the exact thing I downloaded two weeks ago."

Harris: That's incredible. Okay there's two people, you were one and somebody else was the other?

Brown: Joey Jerome, and later Matthew Pfeiffer. For the first ten experiments it was myself and Joey Jerome. After a while, he got a little tired and then Mathew Pfeiffer was the second viewer. And then we all got a little bit exhausted after six months. We had to do some other research. We were all doing some other stuff that we had to get back to, and so we stopped the demonstration.

Harris: Okay, before we go on to something else, because there's so much here.... Give a statement you want to give about time. Can you give me a statement about time that I can quote? Tell me about time.

Brown: What we know for sure is that time does not exist. And I do not mean this as new age metaphor.

Harris: I understand.

Brown: Time is nothing more than a limitation of perception.

Harris: You call it a "limitation of perception."

Brown: Perception - that's all it is. It has nothing to do with the way we live in our physical bodies. Somehow in regards to this three dimensional plus one (time) universe, time anywhere outside of this three dimensional plus one (time) universe just simply doesn't exist. That means that when we remote view something in the past or the future as we did with the thirteen successfully completed experiments in the public demonstration, the future already existed. The past also still exists. Meaning, we were remote viewing a target that was already determined: it was already there. It hadn't yet been chosen for two weeks but this didn't matter. It was still there. We just couldn't see it yet with our physical eyes. We had to wait in our bus ride through the street of time. We had to wait till we got there when our physical perception could actually see the actual target that we remote viewed correctly two weeks or more prior.

Harris: But the obvious question I'm going to ask you is then is it all fixed? Is it all fixed or are there places where we can change the future by jumping in?

Brown: I've had extensive discussions with physicists on this. The remote viewing results clearly show that there is a definite future for any particular time line going out, but if you remote view it, the future, and receive some information and thus change your current behavior, then you can veer off into another future. And no one really knows what to call that, a time dimension, another dimension, another time stream. Even the physicists are arguing what word used for it. But there is only one sequence of events that brings us to our current time stream. You would be talking right now and only one sequence of events have brought us here. However, that doesn't mean there aren't many other possible other histories, but there's only one sequence of events that brought our current perspective to this point in time, this moment where we're having this conversation. We just don't perceive, we don't remember anything that happened in alternative past times. In the future, it's a little bit more variable.

Harris: Okay, now you just used the words, "alternative past time streams" - but these "past time streams" exist? Right? Because these streams all go at the same time. You can jump from one to another. For instance, can I use an example just so I know what's going on.

If the predicted future is that we have a nuclear war but if we can change a behavior then that could be an alternative time stream. Otherwise, we would have no hope right? Is that possible?

Brown: I can use an example. There was a time, and here I'll mention one thing that we did in the past ... we don't do this anymore at the Institute. I just thought that I'd tell you. But we had some inkling of information that suggested that there might be something that could be happening, some terrorist event that could occur. Some people had some sort of vague vision, and we just decided to

explore this as a target. The secret is we sent all of our viewers out to look at it. And they all came back with the same thing. This happened several years ago, right after the Soviet Union broke up, and so many of the viewers came back with some terrorist type of personality shooting a tactical nuclear weapon from some location near New York City, a suitcase-size type tactical weapon, with some type of portable vehicle to transport it to the United Nations. Most viewers were coming back with this person being a Russian or a Slavic person. We got all this information at the Institute. Now we don't have any project like this any longer on the web site. We did this in the old days of the Institute. And this is one case where we sort of said "Oh my goodness, what are we going to do with this information?"

Harris: What year is the old days? Sorry I want to know when this was?

Brown: Approximately 1997. And so we asked, "What are we supposed to do with this? Are we just supposed to file it away? Nobody's talking to us." The Intelligence people weren't talking to us. We decided to just let "them" file this. So we took a risk and just put it up on our web site. When we got this information, you know, we knew we were going to be laughed at. I knew we were going to be mocked. And I knew that people would think we were nuts. But what are we supposed to do with this? If we got laughed at, what's the cost? The cost was only to ourselves. So, we just put it up any way, the whole analyses, the whole stuff. Well, we found out later, a couple months later, a general of the former Soviet Union in Russia (General Lebed), announced formally that there were approximately 128 small tactical weapons missing from the (former) Soviet arsenal, and that they might potentially be in the hands of some groups that are hostile to the United Nations. And then about a month after that, U.S. Security Forces arrested two Lithuanians for trying to sell really small nuclear capable missiles in Miami, and they had been trying to sell them previously in the East Coast and had some problem. But the main idea was that (1) the General himself had admitted that weapons were missing and (2) that Slavic types were actually caught a couple months later trying to sell nuke-capable small portable missiles because they couldn't use them for whatever they were originally trying to do. It was just reported this way, but it wasn't made into a big deal in the press. Yet it circumstantially supports the original remote viewing data.

But then we got a very strange communication after this from somebody in the intelligence community. He actually became interested to what we were doing. Indeed, he became very interested in what we were doing. They (the intelligence community) were monitoring us very closely and he sent us a communication that gave us a transcript of one of our important phone calls so that we would know for sure that he was from the intelligence community, because how else could he have a transcript of our phone calls? He gave us a transcript just to show us who he was, and then he basically indicated that he wanted us to know that while everybody out there was laughing at us, the government was taking what we were doing extremely seriously. Nothing's being missed, and then we got some information afterwards suggesting that something we did made a major difference. Then they would not tell us anything more. Now what were we supposed to do? So the point is, can remote viewing be used to determine future events? Well, we demonstrated for six months that it could be done.

In the old days we used to do more risky targets that were just fun. I mean in the old days, we used to think these things were fun. So we did that one, and it got us into a whole bunch of trouble, and to be quite honest, we probably won't ever again do these things. Now we just want to build up the Institute and focus on the scientific part.

Harris: The trouble is you got monitored right? That was the trouble?

Brown: The trouble is that the whole world laughed at us, and we want to be taken seriously. It is hard to do risky application targets and more sedate science experiments at the same time. The unfair public response to the risky application targets makes it difficult to have people seriously consider our other work.

Harris: Can you now address the ET question?

Brown: Cosmic Voyage and Cosmic Explorers ... those books address my own personal interest in ET material.

Harris: I was just reading this on your personal web site that you said there's a species that are antagonistic. Some say they may be working with the government. Are they?

Brown: That is my interpretation. There's nobody in the government who comes to talk to us about this. But the results of my sessions are very consistent, and there are so many sessions that I've lost count. Cosmic Explorers goes into this in great depth. Apparently, there is an actual conflict going on up there in the skies some place. The government is fully aware that there is a conflict, and that's one of the reasons they don't want any of the ET stuff to come out. It's bad enough that they'll say that there are ETs but, my gosh, they have ETs in a conflict! Which side are we supposed to align ourselves with? Then they are worried about stock market, society....

Harris: I know this, but aren't there a group of ETs working with the government? Are they good or bad?

Brown: Well there's more than one. They're both trying to influence the government. My research clearly suggests that the Greys are good. They're better than benign. They're very good.

Harris: They're very good?

Brown: Yeah. The best test to indicate what is good and what is bad is if you openly acknowledge that they are ETs, and then tell one of the groups to go away. Would they go away? The Greys would go away. But the other group, and I wish there was a better word for them, are reptilians.

Harris: Oh great.

Brown: They would not go away

Harris: They will not go away?

Brown: And they are directly tied in with the government in one way or another and the Greys are trying to influence them (the government) the other way. But the Greys have been very evolutionary about their activities. They're asking permission to do what they do all over the place. But the Reptilians have a very interesting approach. You see, the Reptilians are willing to give technology, and you know how materialistic humans are, especially over small bits of technology. Some will call that group the best friend they've ever had.

Harris: Because of the technology.

Brown: Because of the technology. The little trinkets that they throw.....

Harris: But these reptilians, Are they also shape shifters?

Brown: I have been told about such things, but I do not know.

Harris: Well have you've see a Reptilian, I mean something totally Reptilian?

Brown: Well that is always a question on my mind. We have remote viewed them. Under blind conditions we were told to remote target them, and every time we have a Reptilian target, we end up drawing these pictures of scaly types. Though they do look human, or at least humanoid. And the point is they're probably very beautiful. When I say scaly types, I'm not meaning ugly.

Harris: I understand.

Brown: But they just ... have this type of a skin that sort of seems like a reptilian animal. You know, who knows. The prophets were probably the very first remote viewers, and they even realized Reptilians have been around for a long time. Maybe that's the origin of the mythology of Satan and the snake. In the original Biblical text, the Serpent isn't a snake, a lowly type of creature, a simple reptile. Maybe that's the way it got translated. In the original text, the word they used for this Reptilian guy was a full blooded big humanoid type fellow. We only translated it into a snake. It's not a snake.

Harris: That's interesting.

Brown: The prophets were the ones who were seeing this at first and sort of tried to figure out how to describe it in their own primitive remote viewings, and people later tried to decode the word reptile and ended up calling the guy a snake. But in fact, there is a conflict going on between species on a heavenly level that definitely have different agendas. I actually followed out in an alternative timeline in the book Cosmic Explorers and explored the agenda for the Reptilians. In a future timeline, if we should side with the Reptilians, we end up in very dire circumstances. The Blacks in South Africa under Apartheid in the old days were better off than we will be if we align ourselves with the Reptilians.

But if we go the way of the Greys, or make an alliance with the Greys, things will be better. The remote-viewing evidence clearly suggests that the Greys will not solve any of our problems, meaning they allow us to evolve and make mistakes but...

Harris: We're better off.

Brown: We're better off. We're finding our own way, our own way in the universe.

Harris: But you didn't, but what about the third type which is the - Nordics?

Brown: I've never remote viewed them. They may exist, they may not. I do not know.

Harris: You've never viewed the Nordics?

Brown: You know, time is short, but maybe one day I will be able to get to it.

Harris: Okay. Can I tell you something on a personal level, you mentioned the interview I have on the web on Dr. Michael Wolf. When I went to do Wolf's story, and that's one of my biggest stories, I flew with my Italian co-writer, Adriano Forgione to Connecticut and we were with Wolf all day and then, we left, closed his door and walked to the elevator and we heard these chirping sounds all over the place and we couldn't see where they were coming from. We heard them in the elevator. We heard them downstairs when the elevator door opened. They only stopped when we reached the street. At night something very strange happened in the hotel room. The next morning when Wolf talked to us he said, "well, you didn't see my little Grey Friends. They walked out with you," he says, "they were trying to understand the human love and bonding and he said, "they walked right out the door with you." We only heard chirping - like Dolphin sounds. You mention this chirping connected with the Greys in your book and it struck me!

Brown: That's sort of like a sound that they make. And I have heard that there's sort of a spicy smell sometimes, but I've never smelled it.

Harris: No, there wasn't a smell. It sounded like birds then kind of like dolphins, like a dolphin-bird sound. And I, you know, when you talked about chirping, I guess chirping was the best way I could

describe it. And your book, it just hit a note with me. I said, "Oh my God" you know, that's what - it really happened, I mean, Wolf. I had to believe him because that's what I heard. But is it possible I could hear and not see?

Brown: Oh yeah, definitely. They have a way of making it so you can't see them. You won't see them, you'll just see right through them.

Harris: You can see right through them? I heard them, I mean we couldn't get rid of the sounds. We thought it was the elevator, we opened the door, and then we walked out the front door and we didn't hear them anymore.

Brown: I don't have anyway to comment on what your experience was, I wasn't there. But I do know that the Greys have technology that allows them to be, well, invisible. You can see right through them. You know, that's not something that's really far off for us because in my remote viewing work I have been pushing the idea we are composite beings, that the soul really exists and the body is just a machine. And so obviously when we die, the body drops off, but we're still there. You can't see a "dead" person any longer, but we're still there. I guess you saw the ghost movie with Whoopie Goldberg? So it's sort of like that, and so apparently the ETs have the technology to mimic this. It's only a matter of time before we'll be able to get our own devices that do the same thing. Right now the only way- Well, right now we have only a very primitive ability to interact between the two dimensions that I call "subspace" and physical reality. But I hope that the physical side of things and the metaphysical side continues to be a focus of research so that it's only a matter of time before you get technology that will let us actually interact back and forth between the two dimensions more easily.

Harris: Well it's all exciting, what you're doing is extremely exciting. The reason I had to ask you that question though, Courtney is because, you know, I have so many interviews, I can't take everything as face value, unless because the Wolf experience was bizarre that I couldn't, that I didn't necessarily believe Dr. Wolf I mean...

Brown: I honestly don't know anything about him other than the fact that Richard Boylan talks a lot about him. I know a little about him from your interview, and I found out there that nobody's seen his credentials yet.

Harris: No, I've seen them, I've interviewed him. I've seen them, they're there. I have seen his credentials.

Brown: I'm not raising any doubt about that.

Harris: No, no. You see the problem what Wolf says that he's part of this acclimation program called the slow process release of information. He's being told what he can tell and it's all on a timed. It's a timed release that is partially approved by the government.

Brown: I read an interview where he mentioned something like that on there.

Harris: Yeah, I know. He started to tell me all this.

Brown: We have situations where we have remote viewed certain people and the remote-viewing evidence indicates that they were hybrids of some type and indeed we did find out medically afterwards that this may be true.

Harris: Is that in either one of your books?

Brown: No. I had to take that all that out for publishing reasons. I don't publish anything in my books that has any connection to an identifiable real live person. My publisher thinks it is too risky.

Harris: So you can't take the chance.

Brown: And they don't.

Harris: Listen, I have to wrap this up. I'm calling you from Rome so can you give me, for my article, a message or something you would want people to know, something that's very important that you would want the world to know and I'll promise I'll write it. What would you like people to know?

Brown: That the remote-viewing evidence is absolutely incontrovertible if you have an open enough mind to look at it. And that it would prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that the human soul exists. It's more and more advanced than any other thing that you've ever seen. The only acceptable hypothesis from this is to accept that there is a non-physical component to all of us. We call it a "subspace mind." But the point is that we now have some scientific proof of this. Any reasonable person can see this. That means that we all are just souls, transforming through light years and transcended through time and space, and that we are virtually unbounded. It is our actual personal selves which is unbounded. Our bodies are nothing more than machines. You don't have to believe it, but we don't have to go to a church or a synagogue or a temple or a mosque to be told it, to hope for it, and to pray for it. Now we know through positive scientific reasons that it's proven that our bodies are nothing more than machines, and that our souls are real.

Harris: Is this also included in reincarnation?

Brown: That's a whole other story.

Harris: Well, you said "in between" lifetimes.

Brown: To my knowledge, there's no police force out there that says you can't be reincarnated into another life. So if we know that time doesn't exist, then this idea of reincarnation is actually not exactly correct because all these experiences are going on simultaneously. They're not happening sequentially.

Harris: I know, simultaneously.

Brown: On a level of reality, most importantly to all, is that the soul is truly there. The second most important thing to us is our understanding of time. It is an illusion, a perception, and that means two things; that means everything that was bad, that was ever done by anybody will never go away. That means the Holocaust is still going on right now. That means everything that we do to other people, if we hit our child in anger, minutes later, that means it doesn't ever go away. You can't try to wipe the pain away. The act is always there. If there's ever a molestation that occurs, and someone is actually guilty of that molestation, they can't remove the event in time to phase it out...it always exists.

Harris: It's always there.

Brown: So the most important thing with regard to time is that once people realize that, I really think that people will change for the better. There's a whole new horizon out there that. Nothing ever goes away.

Harris: Conversely any good you do, it's there forever.

Brown: The other side of it is that any good you do, it's there forever. It is so important that you brought up the good side. I was focusing more on the negative, hoping people who do bad won't do it anymore. But the good is always there as well. So those are the two morals of the story.

The bottom line, the most important thing is that we now know for certain that the soul exists.

Secondly, not quite as important, but the second most important thing is that time never fades away. Everything we've ever experienced in the past is still there. Go through the web site and see the scientific experiments and public demonstrations. Strong evidence exists.

Again, you can go to www.farsight.org, that's the non-profit Farsight Institute.

Harris: You know, I read the book and it struck me, and that's why I'm talking to you, because I'm putting together pieces of a puzzle. But I know quite a bit about the whole ET situation. I know quite a bit on the time situation but I'm putting together pieces of a puzzle. What I'm happy about what you're doing is that you're making it scientific because I'm fighting everybody here, saying that this kind of work is non-scientific. It is soft science. In other words, it's pure psychology. It's not, you know.

Brown: And one of the things you can put into this article is that these public demonstrations took place for six months and we're going to do it again, we're going to re-do it again sometime. It wasn't like we did it for one day, we did for six months. And the world is watching, and you can now look at the whole - and so that's what you can say. You can say that the data are scientific.

Harris: I want to thank you so much. It's been really, really interesting and I will get your second book.

Brown: God bless you .

Harris: Thank you very much. God bless you too.