

SG1B

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00789R001900090001-2

Approved For Release 2000/08/08 : CIA-RDP96-00789R001900090001-2

This document is made available through the declassification efforts
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)
document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are
responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages
released by the U.S. Government & Military.

Discover the Truth at: <http://www.theblackvault.com>

SG1B

TASKING: Initially the interviewer was provided a 3x5 card



site." Throughout sessions the interviewer was never told the exact nature of the site, its key facilities nor its mission. In the initial session, the Source was simply given the coordinates of the site, (encrypted to preclude inadvertent geographic cueing as per Extended Remote Viewing (ERV) protocols). In subsequent sessions, Source was again provided the coordinates and a general synopsis of previously reported data. No additional specific tasking emphasis or intentional cueing was provided to Source.

01 - 2 due 80
02 - 4 due 86
03 - 6 due 86

Other A...

2. () SESSION: During the initial session, Source took a "joyride" to an unspecified site whose descriptive data did not coincide with the known data on the site. Source was retargeted, (coordinates repeated) and successfully acquired the site. In subsequent sessions Source was encourage to initially take a "joy ride" to a site of his choosing, (later to be designated "Sanctuary") and from that site, at the direction of the interviewer, he was to move to the target. This technique appeared to eliminate inadvertent reporting on non-related targets and was enjoyable to the Source, therefore, the use of "Sanctuary" targetting will continue on a trial basis to determine its affect on the Source's success rate.

3. () SUMMARY: The following is compilation of the raw and unevaluated data provided by Source during the total of three sessions conducted on this target.

ERV-101
E.L.(M)

a. () A fenced complex of buildings and facilities with a feeling of military involvement. There are numerous scientists and technicians working at the site. Some areas of the site are above ground, (buildings and related facilities), while other areas are underground or at least partially underground. Many of the buildings appear to be abandoned completely including one building (next to a railroad track) which may have once been a depot. This building appears to be outside the compound perimeter but the concept of

SOURCE 003

'Other A' Procedures

(4 Jun 86)

Session #1 - Well into the session, the monitor 'convinced himself' that the site 'must be' an electromagnetic propulsion/railgun research facility. The monitor made no conscious attempt to reject this idea. Consequently, the remainder of the session should be considered as having been 'steered' toward evidencing this objectively insupportable foregone conclusion.

(6 Jun 86)

Session #2 - Monitor entered the session with a 100% (consciously) objective outlook. Began with a Stage 6 matrix. Source was directed to combine two related sketches from Session #1, to draw a circle, (an artificial barrier), around this new sketch, and then to perceive 'information out.' When source perceived a 'multichannel' output point on the circle, he was instructed to draw another circle, representing himself, and to connect it to the 'info out' point, essentially 'plugging into the information.' He then proceeded to objectify the data that he perceived to be associated with each discrete channel.

Ultimately, the most useful Stage 6 tool employed to capture the session's objective, (namely, to determine the type of testing performed at the site), was simply to describe the 'down range' target prior to and after its use.

Source 003
Monitor 099
Matrix A
 000 4 July 86
 5 Tap 0912
 End 1002
 I None

'Other B' Procedures

Session #1/(Source #101) - Run as a Class A site. Consequently, this placed a handicap on (indeed, crippled) the monitor's ability to act as 'navigator', since no reference data were supplied to assist in making 'course corrections'. (Later, the ops officer determined that this session had produced two and a half hours worth of useless information).

Session #2/(Source #101) - Several hours prior to the session, the ops officer provided the monitor with all of the targeting data. As a result, it did not take long to 'guide' the viewer onto the site and to confirm his location through a series of movement exercises. The greater part of the session was spent in Stage 6 in order to derive site layout.

Session #3/(Source #101) - Primary targets were selected using the data supplied by the tasker in combination with site sketch produced by source. The technique, i.e., Stage 6 cueing tool, employed to extract information relevant to the primary target (building) is worth describing:

a) The source was directed to isolate the target by drawing a circle around it. He was then instructed to proceed along the circle by incrementally touching points on it with his pen. At the same time he was to perceive "information", in any form, that seemed to be crossing over this artificial boundary in either direction.

b) Similarly, the source was directed to cup his hands, like an inverted bowl, over his sketch of the target building in order to establish an artificial, dome-shaped boundary. He was then instructed to try and "feel" and describe anything passing through it.

Both the ops officer and the monitor debriefed source, in a very positive and informal atmosphere, after Session #3. However, no feedback was provided.

Session #4/(Source #03) - Source provided a Stage 1-3 description of the target area. He was then directed to move into Stage 4 and provided with the cue 'primary structure.' After describing and sketching a structure, source was then instructed to 'feel' any information passing into and out of the top of the structure. Source was then instructed to perceive groups of data bits, or 'messages' and then to objectify perceptions connected with them. Other general information collection against this target proceeded using normal cueing procedures.

OPERATIONAL QUALIFYING PROJECTS

<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>V03</u>		<u>V18</u>		<u>V21</u>		<u>V101</u>	
	<u>GEN.</u>	<u>SPECIFIC</u>	<u>GEN.</u>	<u>SPECIFIC</u>	<u>GEN</u>	<u>SPECIFIC</u>	<u>GEN</u>	<u>SPECIFIC</u>
A	2 ⁺	2	-	-	0	0	2 ⁺	2 ⁺
B	2	2 ⁺	-	-	2 ⁺	2 ⁺	2 ⁺	1 ⁺
C	3	3 ⁺	-	-	-	-	0	0
D	1 ⁺	1 ⁺	-	-	1 ⁺	2 ⁺	3	3 ⁺
E	3	2	-	-	2	2 ⁺	3	2
F	1	1	-	-	(?)	(?)	1	1
G (87)								
H (87)								
I-1	1 ⁺	1 ⁻	2	2	-	-	2 ⁻	1

UTIL
 OPERATIONAL QUALIFYING PROJECTS

PROJECT	003 V03		01 V18		021 V21		101 V101	
	GEN.	SPECIFIC	GEN.	SPECIFIC	GEN.	SPECIFIC	GEN.	SPECIFIC
A	2 ⁺	2 (2) (AV)	-	-	0	0 (0) (AV)	2 ⁺	2 ⁺ (2 ⁺)
B	2	2 ⁺ (2)	-	-	2 ⁺	2 ⁺ (2 ⁺)	2 ⁺	1 ⁺ (2)
C	3	3* (2 ⁺)	-	-	-	-	0	0 (0)
D	1 ⁺	1 ⁺ (1 ⁺)	-	-	1 ⁺	2 ⁺ (2)	3	3* (2 ⁺)
E	3	2 (2 ⁺)	-	-	2	2 ⁺ (2)	3	2 (2 ⁺)
F	1	1 (1)	-	-	(?)	(?)	1	1 (1)
G (87)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
H (87)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I-1	1 ⁺	1 ⁻ (1)	2	2 (2)	-	-	2 ⁻	1 (1 ⁺)