

Internet Search Image Targets 4A Target tasked by internet image search - IN4A7

Remote viewed by Anita Ikonen - Method EEC

Target no target number

Today April 9, 2019

Start 1:56 PM

Internet Search Images A4 Target 7

Today April 9, 2019

Start 1:56 PM

melon seagulls forest construction

There is a green mush on the bottom and lots of empty space in the air in between and then there is something circling around up in the sky. The main emphasis is on the green mush closer to the ground.

The green mush has brown stems under the green, this is all consistent with trees (premature labeling though). But something rises up into the air, something light and delicate.

Probe element in the sky: Fragile and delicate. It doesn't want to go down to the brown stems.

I just realized something that might be a huge breakthrough in RV: every time when my brain wants to understand what it is experiencing from RV, this activates logic to start to think, and so is that why logic then gets active? Does the thinking precede logic? This would mean that logic is more innocent than we thought.

The green is not flat, there are many parts in the green that are reaching upward like flaps.

There could be a seagull as the top element, I see a fragile ribcage which is easily broken if crushed with a hand. But then logic (of all things) tells me that it could be logic (ironic, huh?) because I know the search words.

2:07 PM End RV.

I had a forest and I had a seagull. Logic was thinking if the green could be part of a melon. There were no elements sighted that could be consistent with a construction whether as a noun (thing) or as a verb (happening).

How do I grade this session? The seagull was very clear in my mind, its ribcage and how fragile it is, the red tissues and blood in its body which was not much in its small body, it flying up above, but I saw it as a purely white seagull, this one is also partially wrong.

Is this an A report but with the inclusion presumably from logic of the forest that was a known search word? Or was this a forest report with the inclusion from logic of the seagull as a known search word? Do you see the problem here? If seagull was RV and forest was logic then the grade is an A with a false impression from logic. If forest was RV and seagull was logic then the grade is a fail

F with an impression from logic of seagull but logic is not RV and logic does not count as grade toward RV. It matters, whether impression came from RV or from logic.

However, we already know that this is a partially blind protocol and not a fully blind protocol, so these margins of the unknown are already assumed. But since here the seagull and the forest were both equally there... no wait a minute, we just solved the problem. The seagull is sitting on a tree trunk. I give this session an A.

Image source <https://www.shutterstock.com/g/paola+nordera>

Image link <https://image.shutterstock.com/image-photo/seagull-standing-on-trunk-looking-260nw-1208291326.jpg>

The question becomes, had I not known that seagull is a search word, would I have had such a clear and vivid impression of a seagull's body and ribcage and chest? Was the impression genuine - I think it was now that I realized there is a tree trunk on the target image, below the seagull. Of course, had I not known that seagull is a search word, I would not have known to say that I saw a seagull, and perhaps I would also not have known to say that I saw the ribcage of a bird specifically as opposed to another frail fragile animal. Nonetheless, we are testing for correlation, and we know of the flaws of this protocol in that we have known search words and thus only a partially blind target, we can still investigate the correlation that happens under these circumstances, and here the correlation was superb, regardless of why, or how, as that would only be speculative since the factors are unknown and unestablished.

2:15 PM End session.