



Aliens On Earth.com

Resources for those who are stranded here



[UFOs](#) | [Paranormal](#) | [Area 51](#)
[People](#) | [Places](#) | [Random](#)
[Top 100](#) | [What's New](#)
[Catalog](#) | [New Books](#)

Search... for keyword(s)

in Page Titles

Our Bookstore
is [OPEN](#)

[Mothership](#) -> [Ufomind Mailing List](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Apr](#) -> Here

This page has been FROZEN as of Jan. 26, 2000. It is not currently maintained, so some links may not work and some information may be out of date. [More Info](#)

The Contradictory Views of Major Ed Dames

From: "Peter P." <ptp@primenet.com>
Date: Wed, 29 Apr 1998 21:23:30 -0800

29 April, 1998

THE CONTRADICTIONARY VIEWS OF MAJOR ED DAMES

by Peter P. (ptp@primenet.com)

In the early 1980s, there was a breakthrough discovery that was soon utilized by the U.S. military. That discovery was a technique coined "remote viewing" (or "coordinate remote viewing") - the ability to use the unconscious mind to accurately gather data and transmit it to the conscious mind. Only later did the public learn of a top-secret unit that employed this technique to gather intelligence and pinpoint unknown targets.

One person inextricably linked to that "remote viewing" unit, in the minds of many present day late-night radio listeners, is Major Ed Dames.

Maj. Dames now works in the private sector, as president of "technical remote viewing" company PSI TECH. It was he who, in the last 15+ years, in his words, "Took the <remote viewing training> protocols down from a 6 month training regime to about 3 weeks, and at PSI TECH we taught this to scientists and engineers in a 10 day very intense project. I cut all the fat off the training program... and modified and finessed it." [1] It is Dames who has made a number of radio appearances, on which he touted PSI TECH's remote viewed predictions.

So how accurate was information collected by early "remote viewing"? According to Joe McMoneagle, another member of the government unit and author of 'Mind Trek', it varied from 35% to 85% depending on the person and other non-specific variables. [2]

That was then, this is now.

According to Maj. Dames, after almost two decades of modification, "The most that we, including myself, the best that we as individuals can do, even the experts, is about 90%... However, when a team of remote viewers, in a team of 5 or 6 people - when they work alone, independently - the mutually corroborating data is 100% correct." [3]

Such a team, involving about ten remote viewers over a nine-month period [4], viewed a cylindric object - released by an alien intelligence - headed towards Earth; it carried a "plant pathogen" that would kill green plants on Earth. This prediction was made before the Hale-Bopp comet passed, in fact the cylinder was "remote viewed" being released from the comet. Last November, Dames said, "I'm saying, as you know, this plant

pathogen that WE'RE predicting actually impacts in Africa sometime between December and February." [5]

Remember, to be 100% accurate, a team - such as the one at PSI TECH - must work the target. (Hence my capitalizations of WE.) And the team, after nine months of sessions, predicted an actual impact in Africa.

During a February 9 radio appearance, Dames noted, "WE ran more remote viewing sessions, did more work, and that particular cylinder is still en route to Earth intercept. WE do have it's expected Earth entry point and that is over Northwest Continental Africa, Mauritania, and it will begin to disintegrate there, moving to the southeast. The impact, from the studies that WE have done, the impact is expected along an imaginary line from Eritrea in the north to Swaziland in the south, but the center of mass in the Burundi, Lake Victoria region, where there will actually be a remnant of the cylinder that WE expect to impact and crater." [6]

Still on-target, the team "remote viewed" - accent on VIEW - a remnant of the cylinder that was expected to impact and crater.

Here is our first contradiction, albeit a minor one. Did they view it impacting or not? The first set of team sessions, as discussed by Dames in November, revealed an "actual impact". Now, with additional sessions, an impact is 'expected'. To expect something to happen is one step up from guessing it will. Or perhaps too much emphasis is being placed on that one word - "expect". After all, it could've been a slip of the tongue on Dames' part.

Cut to late April, at least two months after the predicted arrival date of the 'plant pathogen' cylinder - and no actual impact. At that time, Dames amended the original view with, "The cylinder is no longer detectable (by remote viewing). The cylinder, in essence, evaporated in the skies over Africa and the spores are over Africa right now." He added, "We nailed down the nature of this plant pathogen... It is a fungus. It is a super blight." [7]

He went on to say it would soon spread, via the Trade Winds, over Latin America and the Caribbean. How quickly? "The Trade Winds will quickly carry this, in a matter of weeks, to the Caribbean & Latin America.", Dames said. [8]

But if the team was wrong about the impact, could it be mistaken about the spores? That is not the only contradiction. But another example should be used to exemplify the other contradiction, the matter of time-frames.

In November ('97), Dames offered, "WE used the search cue of 'next nuclear attack' and WE qualified that with 'intent to kill' and 'massive casualties', and what WE got was a very clear picture at the end of a week <of sessions>, of the North Koreans using a nuclear weapon against the South Koreans. Now analytically we think... analytically, now... that this event may occur before the end of the winter."

Art Bell, the radio host interviewing Dames, asked, "Before the end of this winter?"

Dames replied, "Before the end of this winter." [9]

How is a time-frame established? In a later broadcast, Dames explained, "When we search out a specific target, if we do not constrain the search to time - to the present, the future or the past - then we don't know where we are in time... You want to constrain the search to a certain era, a certain point in time." [10] In other words, not by analyzing the data but by constraining the search.

Which is another contradiction.

So how did Dames explain the non-occurrence of such an event, come late April; over a full month into Spring?

In Dames' words, "What we can't do accurately is look at the time windows We're very loose in time - 3 to 6 months minimally. It's very difficult to establish precise times in the future. We can describe events very accurately. For instance, we're stating that a nuclear weapon will be used on the Korean Peninsula. The next use will be there but we can only look at the scenario that we describe that says it will occur at a time when meetings break down between the North and South, and the North is starving." [11]

Meetings between the two sides have broken down at least three times in the last six months and the North Koreans have been starving even longer. Those are not unique occurrences, so how accurate can they be as event markers? Such markers may occur, over and over, for months... or years.

Almost in the same breath, on Korea, he added, "I think we're hours or days from something horrible. We know that the scenario will start as a ground war. How fast it will escalate to the use of a nuclear weapon, I don't know, but that will be next and that is what we stand by." [12]

We don't know when it will happen, but we're days away from it. Huh?

When both the plant pathogen and nuclear attack events were predicted, it was in the context of a team-viewed event and predicated on 100% accuracy. To claim otherwise now, for whatever reason, looks at the very least like contradictory claims -- and at the most, like furious backpedaling.

Contradictions aside, the bottom line is this -- If you can't accurately pinpoint the time-frame, but still say when to expect an event, you'll never be 100% accurate. To claim otherwise is foolhardy - or worse.

=====

Bibliography:

- [1] TRANSCRIPTS, at: <http://www.artbell.com>
Ed Dames on April 24, 1998; part 1, pp. 9 of 18
- [2] "Major Ed Dames and his Remote Viewed Prophecies - Addendum"
by Greg Wright, MUFON - RIVERSIDE, CA CHAPTER
<http://www.blackhole.net/mufon/text/dames2.htm>
- [3] TRANSCRIPTS, at: <http://www.artbell.com>
Ed Dames on Nov 25, 1997; part 1 (of 8), pp. 9 & 10 of 15
- [4] "Major Ed Dames and his Remote Viewed Prophecies"
by Greg Wright, MUFON - RIVERSIDE, CA CHAPTER
<http://www.blackhole.net/mufon/text/dames.htm>
- [5] TRANSCRIPTS, at: <http://www.artbell.com>
Ed Dames on Nov. 25, 1997; part 5 (of 8), pp. 5 of 17
- [6] TRANSCRIPTS, at: Ibid.
Ed Dames on Feb. 9, 1998; part 3 (of 8), pp. 4 & 5 of 18
- [7] TRANSCRIPTS, at: Ibid.
Ed Dames on April 24, 1998; part 1, pp. 15 & 16 of 18
- [8] TRANSCRIPTS, at: Ibid.
Ed Dames on April 24, 1998; part 2, page 4 of 19
- [9] TRANSCRIPTS, at: Ibid.
Ed Dames on Nov 25, 1997; part 2 (of 8), pp. 16 & 17 of 20
- [10]TRANSCRIPTS, at: Ibid.
Ed Dames on April 24, 1998; part 1, pp. 12 of 18
- [11]TRANSCRIPTS, at: Ibid.
Ed Dames on April 24, 1998; part 2, pp. 9 of 19
- [12]TRANSCRIPTS, at: Ibid.
Ed Dames on April 24, 1998; part 2, pp. 11 of 19

-----+-----
| UFOMIND MAILING LIST |
| Supporting the World's Largest Paranormal Website |
| www.ufomind.com Moderator: Glenn Campbell |
|
| Archived at: <http://www.ufomind.com/misc/> |
| Submissions to: ufomind@lists.best.com |
| "unsubscribe"/"subsingl" to: ufomind-request@lists.best.com |
|-----+-----

RELEVANCE OF THIS MESSAGE: psi personalities

Index: [Ed Dames](#) (#8)

[Mothership](#) -> [Ufomind Mailing List](#) -> [1998](#) -> [Apr](#) -> [Here](#)

[Our Design and Original Text Copyrighted](#) © 1994-99 [Area 51 Research Center](#)

PO Box 30303, Las Vegas, NV 89173 Glenn Campbell, Webmaster & Moderator

This site is supported by the [Ufomind Bookstore](#)
Please visit our business if you appreciate our free web services. [New Items](#)

Send us corrections using this [Feedback Form](#) or email webmaster@ufomind.com

This page: <http://www.ufomind.com/misc/1998/apr/d30-001.shtml> (6/5/0 12:29)
We encourage you to link to this page from your own. No permission required.

Created: Apr 30, 1998