UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

memorandum

DATE: 1 September, 1987

REPLY TO ATTN OF: DT-S (018)

SUBJECT: End of Stage critique for Stage 4 training (for 025).

TO: DT-S (ATTN: ███████████)   SG1J

1. (S-SS) <u>PERIOD OF TRAINING</u> : 025 began Stage 4 lectures by 095 on July 1, 1988. Hands-on training on began July 8, 1988, under the tutelage of 049, was transferred to me (018) July 20, 1988, and finished Stage 4 training August 31, 1988.

2. (S-SS) <u>PROGRESS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS</u>: During 025's Stage 4 training, the following accomplishments were made:

    a. <u>COLUMNS</u>: A natural tendency to place perceptions in incorrect columns was overcome to a major extent. Perceptions still wind up in incorrect columns at times, but 025 now tends to have a much higher sense of structural awareness, and catches his/her own mistakes. Any further problems with this will be overcome with experience, if 025 and monitors alike continue to give immediate correction.

    b. <u>MOVEMENT</u>: Movement exercises in space, time, and concepts were performed. 025 did not have any problem with this aspect of Stage 4 at any time.

    c. <u>PROBING FOR PERCEPTIONS</u>: 025 learned to use Stage 3 results, Stage 4 perceptions, and the empty Stage 4 columns, themselves for gaining further perceptions.

    d. <u>IMPACT</u>:

        1) <u>EI</u>: 025 had two targets in which the EI column provided most of the major information. Results were good, and provided 025 with a positive experience in using this column to probe for emotions, attitudes, and site-specific information. During these two sessions, 025 was shown the basic difference between EI (emotions at the site, such as the target person's feelings about themselves) and AI (RVer's emotions about the site, such as the viewer's feelings about the target person), and how they might often conflict.

<u>HANDLE VIA SKEET CHANNELS ONLY</u>

SECRET/NOFORN

CLASSIFIED BY: DIA (DT)
DECLASSIFY: OADR

OPTIONAL FORM NO. 10
(REV. 1-80)
GSA FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.6
5010-114

☆ GPO : 1985 O - 461-275 (364)

P

2) <u>AI</u>: 025 had four sessions on one specific target which was selected partly for the purpose of providing the most extreme AI experience (that is, one which is so objectionable to the viewer that it is completely denied and therefore goes undetected). Post session instruction showed 025 how to recognize such mentally undetectable AI through physical reactions and/or off-handed comments made during the session.

e. <u>AOL/AOL SIGNAL</u>: Constant attention was given throughout all sessions to stress the importance of being able to determine the difference between valid perceptions, analytic overlay (AOL) and AOL SIGNAL (or AOL matching). Some progress was made, but there are still many occurrences of the three major problems indicated below. It should be noted that these same three major problems plague the most experienced viewers, often to the same degree as or greater than 025 is experiencing. These three problems are:

1) The tendency to label valid perceptions as AOL, "just in case" they aren't right. This deals with the natural tendency of all viewers to doubt their ability to do this kind of work.

2) The tendency to label AOL SIGNAL perceptions as AOL, and to break from the signal line. No valid rule of thumb has been devised to accurately or consciously tell the difference, but it was noted during 025's training that he/she tends to continue writing down the page when labeling valid perceptions, but tries to "go back up" higher on the page, where other writing has already taken place, when objectifying an AOL. This practice is also maintained during the labeling of perceptions as AOL. A review of session transcripts shows that valid perceptions or A/S perceptions which 025 has incorrectly labeled as AOL tends to be written beside or higher on the page than the other written EEI which precede them. 025 has not been informed of this tendency, as it appears to be a valuable analytic tool, and 025's awareness of it might prevent it in future sessions.

3) The tendency to accept AOL's as valid perceptions. There is no set rule of thumb for either the detection or the resolution of this problem, and 025 has shown in Stage 4 training to have neither a greater nor lesser tendency to make this mistake than "more advanced" viewers.

f. <u>REPORTING</u>: 025's written session reports tend to be run-on, single paragraph listings of session highlights, often using incomplete sentences to indicate the impressions gained. There is, at present, no "formal format" for session summaries, since individual styles tend to impart such accurate reporting of perceptions received. 025's individual style of reporting has been completely satisfactory in this respect. Therefore, 025 was briefed on a more formalized method of preparing session summaries, but no requirement to adhere to a formalized style was

made.

g.   FAILURE: Perhaps one of the most difficult aspects of training for a student is that of failure to properly achieve the expected results.   025 had 2 sessions in which he/she apparently "switched targets" mentally, getting the EEI for one session which should have been gained for the other, and vice versa.   025 was appraised of the fact that even when proper EEI is gained, if it is not gained in such a way that it will be reported for the correct tasking, that session must be considered a failure.   025 was quick to see the logic behind this, and to understand and agree that a failure had been made.

g.   TARGET TYPES: 025 was given targets which would train in the following types of perceptional awareness:

1)   Awareness of Stage 2 perceptors (Physical descriptions required) Target tasking of this type ranged from general descriptors of battleships, down to detailed descriptors of an astronaut's shoe sole.

2)   Awareness of Dimensional perceptors.   In this respect, 025 was constantly reminded during sessions that Stage 4 dimensional perceptions are for gestaltic dimensionals only (i.e. "large", "heavy").   Stage 6 is used for dimensional relationships (i.e. "larger than...", "heavier than...").   025 had the natural tendency to try for dimensional relationships in Stage 4, and was shown in post-session reviews each time, that such perceptions in Stage 4 are usually incorrect, and often lead to AOL.

3)   Aesthetic Impact awareness [see 2.b.2), above].

4)   EI (Descriptions of target person's feelings, emotions, etc.

5)   Perceptions of Tangibles and Intangibles were often confused.   This is an area where further attention should be given in future training.

6)   AOL and A/S: see 2.e., above.   Probably more stress was placed on awareness of this one aspect of Stage 4 functioning than on any other.   025 quickly grew to accept the idea that perceptions might as quickly come from imagination as from the subconscious "signal line", and learned to question the source of such perceptions, without losing confidence in his/her work.   In this respect, 025 learned an exceptional amount, progressing rapidly and very well.

3.   (S/SS) 025 has made progress very rapidly.   025 is conscientious and dedicated to the mastery of this art.   Further experiences with the CRV method will certainly provide this office with an excellent Remote Viewer.   025 is ready for Stage 5 & 6 training, having already reached experiences in Stage 4 which would require resolution through Stage 5 and/or 6 techniques,

025
31 August 1988

During stage four, I had stronger contact with the signal line. gThe matrix provided me with a systematic structure for decoding information. This enabled me to focus on details in an organized manner.

In stage four, I was able to perceive more dimensions and stage two data which is directly related to specific tangibles. Now that I have experienced certain tangibles, I will have a better idea of what these items are in the future.

The intangibles are concepts which really help to describe what type of site I am working on. This column points out abstract qualities which are not specifically defined by physical characteristics.

The emotional impact and AOL signal columns were the most challenging. It was fascinating to discover emotions and feelings of people at a site. Actually, my favorite type of target is a person. I am progressively learning more about analytic overlay and the associated ramifications. In other words, I am just beginning to sort out relevant verses irrelevant information. Towards the end of stage four, I did not rely as heavily on the AOL columns and found myself trusting my own viewing.

The monitor guided me throughout my sessions and provided valuable CRV techniques to facilitate viewing. For example, I learned not only to probe ideograms for additional data, but also sketches. The prompting and cuing movement exercises were especially helpful. I was very surprised to discover, through the advice of the monitor, an aesthetic impact that I never would have realized on my own. The monitor was always aware of what was happening and able to help me progress regardless of the circumstances. I appreciate the persistence and patience. I am confident that stage five will be just as interesting and enjoyable.