

CLEARING TECHNOLOGY

A lecture given on
15 November 1962

Thank you.

All right, this is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, November 15, AD 12. A lot of things I could talk to you about, by the well-known ton, actually. Very hard to select any particular point to discuss because we're pretty well there technologically. All of these points have to be talked about more, have to be sorted out more; there's got to be more data on these things. I'm at a point where I'm getting ready to condense old tapes into bulletins and that sort of thing. I'm in a very patch-up state, you know, of making it all neat.

But a lot of data continues to appear and naturally would. Once you've climbed a mountain, why, you idle around and look down the mountainsides and you can find a lot more ways you could have gotten up the mountain. There are always more visible ways. So you can look forward to all manner of stuff like this and speculations. The one thing you mustn't forget is how you got up the mountain in the first place and how you can get people up the mountain. And you start getting too many alternate routes going up this mountain and the next thing you know people start falling in crevasses and so on because the road isn't mapped.

But this first thing I'd like to talk to you about is – it's sort of hard to choose which is what – is a method... This method, by the way – I have not found a goal by this method; I'm just going by data known. This method is an experimental method. But I'm about to plow in and use it like mad and I'm sure that it'll work, as you will be sure in just a moment too.

And that is, one of the reasons you don't like to see long goals lists these days is because it takes quite a little bit of time to tiger drill every goal. And it's sort of hard to go over long goals lists and so on, whereas an auditor in the past was perfectly willing to cover 250 or 300 goals, and didn't think this was very much. You suddenly give an auditor a list of 300 goals and tell him he's to tiger drill those 300 goals and he tends to blanch. Because he's actually looking at quite a little span of auditing. And particularly if a case is not ready ... This lecture isn't totally concerned with 3GA Criss Cross, therefore I've just given it some notes, and it's just some notes on current processing, is about the only title you could give this lecture.

Now, he's going to take an average of a minute per goal to get these three hundred goals down, see? But if a case is running very hard and if a case is terribly burdened and should be

unburdened before it's audited on 3GA Criss Cross, you're going to have two phenomena occur. While you're doing a goals list, you're going to get a dirty needle.

Now, understand the – remember your somatics bulletin of last week. Dirty needle is a persistent activity, and a dirty read is the instant manifestation of a dirty needle. And so when I say “dirty needle” I mean the persistent dirty needle. I meant to straighten that out with you tonight because I think we've got an auditor who's got them mixed up. He thinks if he gets dirty instant reads on the ends of goals that then this list has a dirty needle. No, no. No, it's those reads that occur during and amongst and after and before and they're all going *tickety-skrikety-scratch*, and you can't read through the stuff, you know, and so on. It's like trying to tune in Tokyo on a crystal receiver, and it just won't do it. Now, that's a dirty needle, which makes a quite different manifestation than a dirty read.

You know, your dirty read – it just goes instantly *bzzzt*. There's a little *bzrrt* to the needle. So what. That doesn't mean anything at all. That – the most that means – well, it – you can get “Fail to reveal,” “Careful ofs,” “Invalidates,” things like that can do it. And goals themselves will sometimes give a dirty read and so on. That doesn't mean anything. Most it means is your mid ruds are out for the session. That's the most it means. And if you're getting too many in and they have all got dirty reads, well, the pc's just got a missed withhold, that's all that's wrong. You'll get used to this and get it sorted out, now I've called some of this to your attention.

No, I'm talking about the persistent static on the needle. That's a dirty needle – persistently staticky. And when you've got a dirty needle and you're trying to go down the list, we used to call it the pc's needle pattern. Only sometimes it's much more serious than just a pattern. Any pattern means something is wrong. Pcs shouldn't have patterns. The pc isn't prepared and the pc hasn't got his rudiments in if you've got a needle pattern. You don't audit with needle patterns. You go around auditing with the belief that there is such a thing as a needle pattern and you'll get in trouble right from the beginning, because of course it merely means that the pc is improperly prepared; it means a lot of things. Some pcs have very, very filthy dirty needles before you find the first item. That is just at the drop of a hat, why, the needle dirties up, and so on.

Well, to that degree – to that degree, you have an awful time getting in your rudiments so that you can get a clean enough needle to list and assess something, or assess the Prehav Scale so that you can find some level to get an item from or something like that. There is your toughest struggle.

But you'll find out that if after you've listed a list and started to null a list, that you have a dirty needle – not dirty reads; you have a dirty needle, a distinct pattern – and you try to get in your mid ruds and you've got a dirty needle still, and that sort of thing, you just – you'll learn better than to box around with a dirty needle with mid ruds. You'll just realize that your list is not complete. And after you've gotten skunked a half a dozen times, maybe you'll

remember I told you this. They read with a dirty read. Every item you read reads with a dirty read. There's nothing rock slams. You get down to the end of the list; you've got several reading with a dirty read, you tiger drill them, and it goes *bzz-bzz-bzz*, and there's nothing in. Oup! Nothing slams. You've gotten nowhere.

Well, the first manifestation you get of that is, given rudiments in and pc prepared – if it has a dirty needle, you see, if it's a dirty needle situation as you start to null – you've got an incomplete list.

Now, there's two things you can do. You can list from the wrong thing to list from. You've done a Prehav assessment and it's wrong. This pc can't be approached on “What isn't part of existence?” In other words, your A of that bulletin of last week that gives you the steps of assessment – your A is just dead-wrong. This is a gone dog, you know. You've listed this pc way over his head. You've said, “Well, I know what's wrong with this pc: he blames everybody.” And you couldn't get a Prehav assessment anyhow, so you just took, Blame, and say, “Well, who or what would you blame?” or “Has he done something weird?” And you listed this thing out and so on, you go back and start nulling it, why, you're going to get a dirty needle all the way, and it wouldn't matter whether you extended this list to China, you're not going to get an item on it. Do you see that as a liability?

Now, supposing you take off fortuitously in the right direction. When you list the list and an item does and is going to occur on that list, you'll find out when you start to null it you don't have dirty needles. That's the first list you list on a pc, and that's every other list too. But it even takes care of this phenomenon of the – of the case that's chronically a dirty-needle case – at the drop of a hat he turns on a dirty needle, see? You take it from the right source, you list that list, you start to null it and you don't see any vestige of a dirty needle – you have got an item on that list, you have cured his dirty needle. Follow that? You understand what I'm talking to you about?

Audience voices: Yeah.

Yeah. In other words, this even takes care of your first thing. In other words, your jump-off from part A of that bulletin on what – what's the line you're going to list, you know? “Who or what would you rather not have anything to do with?” See? All right, that's correct. And you've listed your list. When you go to null it out, if the list is complete, and everything else, you're not going to have any dirty needle on the thing. And then that follows for all additional lists.

When you've listed from the proper question and you're going to have a slamming item on the list and that question is proper, the only reason thereafter that you will get a dirty needle, and the mid ruds don't put it in, see, and you just have to practically rack the pc up one side and down the other. You just chew him to pieces with mid ruds if you keep going like this. You're never going to get rid of the dirty needle. It'll just stay out two items and it'll be

back again, you know? And you give him the mid ruds and the thing is – your needle's nice and smooth now. And then you say, “Waterbuck – tiger,” it's dirty again. Your list is not *complete*. There's no item on the list. The missed withhold on that list is the item. It hasn't been put on it.

So there are two – two variables there: Either your list isn't long enough to include the item or you're not listing from a proper question that gives you the item. Either way you're going to be in trouble and have a hard run of it from the pc, with the pc, you see? You're going to have a tough time of it.

Now, because there are two variables it makes it a little harder on you, because you don't know which one is really out. And – but by trial and error consider that one is out and then consider the other's out. You understand? I mean, you just take it from some other question. Consider the first step, the question there, as wrong. So you take another question. Man, when you've got the right question, you list that thing down, you list it to a complete list, there's an item on it; the whole characteristic of the pc as far as the meter is concerned looks entirely different. This is the easiest running pc you ever saw in your life.

One of the reasons some of you have trouble trying to find items is, is you've never asked the right question to get the item and have – then have never completed a list long enough to include the item and then never null down to the item. And of course, you always are going to be in trouble. You is a gonna say – auditing is impossible, there isn't any way at all to audit. You can't enter the case, you do nothing for the case and so forth.

That just stems from two sources: (1) the question you're listing from is improper, or your list isn't long enough to include the item. See? It's just those two things. There's the only two things that can be wrong on any list that you're nulling. So this also applies to goals.

You get this pc to write 850 goals in Routine 3-21. Now, you've been asking me for a long time, what do you do with these goals. Well, I hated to tell you, you have to take 850 goals and tiger drill them on down to the – to the raw depths, see, because this looked to me – like an awful job to me. I spent about fifteen hours on a pc doing this. And I consider this is quite a lot of work. Because it was a dirty needle all the way. I didn't know this rule at that time and that was why I was continuing on down the line.

But this rule of the complete list and the right question applies to the goals. Except there's one other rule you get with goals: If goals go out hard on Tiger Drilling, why, the case is too charged for you to be assessing for goals. You're not asking the right question to get a goals list and you're not writing a long enough list to get the goal on it. You see, all these things apply. You actually have two manifestations: You've got a dirty needle – on a goals list, you've got a dirty needle, and goals go out hard when tiger drilled. In other words, you sit there and you ask them questions and “Suppress” and you ask them “Invalidate” and “Careful of” and you ask them and ask them and you ask them and you ask them, and they give you

more answers, and the thing still reacts, and you get the suppresses off, you get this off. And you say, aah ...

You know that can go on for three three-hour sessions on one lousy goal that will eventually go out in the end? Well, consider what it is. It's just too heavily charged a case to find a goal on. See, that's an additional manifestation. You find goals going out hard, you'd better start finding items. See, that's your rule. Goals go out hard, don't spend the rest of your life ... By all means wash out the goal that you're working on, otherwise the pc'll dramatize it or something. But goals go out hard on the pc? Well, get yourself going on a new lineup.

Now, the experimental action here that I was talking to you about. . . None of this is – none of what I've just been giving you is experimental at all. This other one is this: You can tiger drill a goals list all the way from the beginning to the end, but the truth of the matter is, that unless a goal has been tampered with – we found the pc's goal and it submerged; see, we found it and prepchecked it, it disappeared from view – it's going to come back in someday if we keep working at it and so on. That's the liability, see: that a badly handled goal will disappear from sight and you can't get a trace of it again. That's a liability.

But let's take the pc, now, whose goal has not been found. Well, you could do this with a goals list – and this is the experimental step, and you can see at once now you won't care how long a goals list the pc has – you just go ripping down the list saying each goal once. Just go down the list, bang, bang, bang, each goal once, you know? *Pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow*. Don't even tell them they're in or out. And those that react – those that react, put a slant on them. Just mark those that react. Don't mark the goals out, because it's liable to give your pc a bit of an ARC break or something. You can also use that too – I will tell you how – if you did want to mark them out.

But you go down the line, you're going to find, 850 goals – if your rudiments are in and if the goal is on the list, why, you're going to find that that goal – the residual at the end of your list, reading them all once, may be as few as 40 goals. See, the theory is this – that a goal, if it's the goal, will be somewhat charged. If it's somewhat charged, it's instantaneous in its reaction and it'll fire the first time and the only time you read it, see? So you just make sure you don't miss any reads and just go on down the list reading each goal once, *pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow*, see? Keep your eye on that meter. See, don't say it's in or it's out. And if the thing quivers, why, give it a slant mark. Too many stay in, your mid ruds went out.

Now, that gives you a condensed goals list. That gives you the best chances out of this list, and on a short list, of course, you only get two or three staying in, or one or something. That's the one you tiger drill. If you got a reaction on it when you went down it the first time, you tiger drill it. You relegate your Tiger Drill, then, to the residual. The goals that remain after you've read them once.

Now, that kind of opens the door to an interesting view, here. We don't care how many

goals the pc writes. And we're going to take care of all the pc's goals lists. Just take care of them all. And the pc's got goals lists, well, do this with them. Goal may be on it.

Now, if you're not scratching them all out, of course you're not invalidating the pc's goal. Funny part of it is you're liable to turn on a somatic reading that goal just once, so you want to be very careful for the pc to tell you if he gets a pain. And about the bottom of every page of goals remind him to tell you if he gets a pain. This is quite important. Because the pain runs deeper than the meter. Pain goes deeper than a meter. And the funny part of it is that even though the pc's goal has been manhandled, the probability is that a little attention to it will turn on pain before it shows on the meter. It's dead as a mackerel on the meter but you can make it show a somatic on the pc. That's quite interesting. So you want to tell the pc always to give you the hot dope if he got a pain.

Now, allow for the comm lag of the beast. Allow for the pc's comm lag. He probably didn't wake up to the pain, until two or three goals have gone by. So the pc says, the goal the pc says the pain occurred on – the way the old song went, “Ain't necessarily so.” It may be three, four or even five goals earlier than when he noticed it. It's quite remarkable that if you read a series of five goals from a goal which bears pain, and the pc is not advised of it in advance, you may be at goal three, four or five before the pc will say, “I had a somatic.” You say, “What one did it appear on?” And he'll usually point to the wrong one. He'll point late.

So what you do in that case; the pc says, “Ow! I had a pain.”

You say, “Well, where did it turn on?”

“Well,” he says, “just as you read that goal there, 'to shoot game wardens'.”

You say, “All right. Thank you.” Now, just count back up from that several goals, go upstairs, and say, “Now, let's watch for this somatic again. I'm not calling you a liar or anything, but we want to move into it the same we did before, see?” So – so just read him that, and now read them three – just read the thing three times. This has run it long enough for the individual, you see, to find out if it's turning on a somatic. And then see where you are. You might have passed over that goal.

Now, if you were marking all the goals out that you didn't get a reaction on and you mark the pc's goals out, he'll ARC break within a page and a half. You could use that to find a pc's goal, too. You could! You could say, “That's out” – X. You're going on down the line, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*.

Pc says, “*Rarrarr.*”

“What's the matter?”

“Well, I just never had such a lousy auditor in my life, and it's too cold in the room, and everything is going to hell in a balloon.”

Do the last page and a half, see? For good measure, do the last two pages. Now, don't – don't underestimate this. The ARC break is *exclamatory*, man. It'll be the wildest ARC break you've seen in many a day. Some pcs whose goals have been passed over on some list and nobody has found them to this day, have been ARC breaking from that moment forward and they're almost impossible to audit. Did you ever put your two and two together and recognize that somebody's goal was probably ticked last November, and this November they are still yapping? And that's how much force and power there is in the situation, see?

One of the things you want to inspect on a chronically ARC breaky pc is when somebody did a goals list and where is the list. Pc won't know the goal, but he'll be ARC breaky about it. Which is quite, I think, remarkable. Talk about mental mechanisms! So you actually could use that mechanism. Mark them out, read them once and mark them out, read them once and mark them in, you know? If you mark his goal out, man, page and a half, two pages later, you're really going to hear about it certainly by that time. He'll just be getting worse, you see. He'll be smoldering for about a page, you see, and then nattering for a quarter of the next page and then about halfway down the next page he explodes. Most gorgeous thing you ever cared to watch in your life. Not reliable to this degree: you can't count on it having been found last November and the pc still ARC breaking. He probably gave up ARC breaking on it by February and he's been in apathy ever since. He's not necessarily demonstrative on this subject, because he can go below antagonism – as anybody who knows the Tone Scale can see.

All right. Now you've got – you've got yourself a situation then where you can take any quantity of goals lists and if you're worried about how you find a goal after you find items, I just refer you to lists 1 to 10 of the original 3GA, see, on the Criss Cross steps. Those lists with their headings, see. If you were an oppterm see, or if you were part of oppterm, why, what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve? See? What goal of yours would be impossible to achieve? If you were a mason, why, what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve? And so he gives you a list, see. You don't even care if he writes them in session or not. Well, you can always take this list and you can rip on down the list of thirty, forty goals, something like that – just read them once, see? Find out if anything fires. Nothing fires, abandon it, see? One fires, tiger drill it. Starts going out hard, wish you hadn't started tiger drilling it.

Now, you understand, you're not looking for a rocket read on that first elimination. You're not looking for the rocket read. You're just looking for something in. Now, it'll do all sorts of things. A real goal seldom rock slams, but it – they've been known to. And they tick, they stick, steep falls. They just react on the needle – usually your first manifestation on most of them.

So therefore, any time one of these stays in, you simply mark it in, and you've got – you've got a goal that you can go back to. Now, I don't know that I would stop right there and

tiger drill it. I don't know that I would necessarily do this. But you'll find that you're doing this on a lot of short lists. There are thirty, forty goals, and so forth. And I'd tear down the lot. Because you might get into trouble, tiger drilling every time something flicked. It'd be sort of a bad course to pursue, because most of your short lists, you're only going to have two goals left in – going to have two that reacted slightly.

Now, on all assessment, when the mid ruds are out, you can get a persistence of read, so that every time you say something to the pc it stays in. And I look at some of your elimination – I mean, some of your elim . . . Your lists – nulling of your lists, and on the first one: in, in, in, in, in, that one's out. And then in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in... Wake up, man! The pc invalidated about the second one in, way up above you someplace. Of course, everything is in since. See? You're not – you're not doing an elimination of goals or items, you're doing an elimination of mid ruds. See, that thing has been out.

Now, the more complete the list is, the less tendency there is for that to happen. You know, so the pc gets an invalidation of something. Pc says, “Oh, that wasn't it.” Your next one – he says it to himself, see; he doesn't say it to you.

And the next one seems in and the next one is in, and the next one in. In, in, in, in, man – I never see more than three in's in a row and I start blowing up. See, I start saying “Ha-ha-ha-ha! Well, now, what happened there?” I'll even hand the list to the pc and say, “Which one of these things, now, did you invalidate? Which one of these?”

And he'll look up the line, “Well, it's that one. Oh, yes. Yes, yes. I thought so-and-so and so-and-so.”

“Thank you so much,” I say sarcastically. And then do the next two again. They're all invariably out.

Now, if your list is complete, this will happen to you very seldom, and your needle won't be giving a continuous dirty manifestation and all that sort of thing. And you really can sail if you've got a complete list and your mid ruds are even vaguely in. The most it takes, if you've got a complete list, to keep your mid ruds in, is, “You want to tell me something or say something?” to the pc. You notice you have three consecutive ones in.

I got – I've gotten fooled. I have cleaned up the mid ruds, straightened everything up, had the pc ARC break, straightened it all out – I was cleaning cleans, you see – and you know, and the pc didn't have anything to say and go back to the list after everything is all straightened out and find out that those three are still in. Is my face red, see! That should happen, you know? I had five, once, consecutively stay in. Almost blew up the session. So of course, the next time I had five in I said well maybe it could happen and then when I went around again found out that none of the five were in. The first had simply been invalidated.

All right, now you're going down a column and the pc says, “Oh, well, none of these

could be me. This has no relationship to me whatsoever. And I just hope nothing reads, because it hasn't anything much to do with me. And if I sit here carefully enough, why, we'll be able to get through this." And you go three consecutive pages of Xs. Well, long before you get to three consecutive pages of Xs, it should occur to you to ask the pc "Suppress" and "Careful of." Not all of your mid ruds, just "Suppress" and "Careful of." Should long since have occurred to you.

I don't let more than about eight or nine Xs go by before I throw a "Suppress" and "Careful of" in there just to make sure. Then imagine my embarrassment to have a totally complete list, an absolutely flawless reading needle, no rudiment even slightly out and the only one which was going to remain in at the end was the item. Drives you mad, because of course you think the pc is suppressing all the time and you just sort of grit your teeth and hope, you know? It's an interesting roly coaster.

Anyway, this gives you an opportunity – this method of elimination of goals; just by reading on down the list of goals once – it gives you an opportunity to get the pc to list lots of goals. And you can tell the pc, "Why don't you list some goals. If you were an oppterm, you know, what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve?" you know? And you've gotten four or five oppterm, so get him to list a raft of them. You know? List against each oppterm.

And then, of course, terminals – that's dead easy. You just say, "What would be the goal of a (terminal)?" See? "What goals would a (whatever the terminal is) have?"

You've got several terminals there, all more or less the same breed of cat, the same sort of thing, and you say, "Well, this sort of terminal now – what sort of goal would this sort of terminal have?" You know? And you get yourself a goals list. Lots of ways you can approach this.

You probably ask yourself, "Well, I know we find items, items, items, items, items; but when do you ever come in and find a goals list, see?" Well, the reason I haven't told you very much is because there really isn't any good answer to it. You can just get yourself a goals list most any time. And the reason I hadn't given you a lot of packaged ways to get goals lists out of it – well, it's just because I felt bad about all this Tiger Drilling of great long lists and I knew I had to get down and solve that.

In the first place, a pc, knowing his auditing is going to be tied up by all this Tiger Drilling, becomes very loath to give you long lists of goals. But if that isn't going to take any time at all, why, you've got it, you see? Pc doesn't mind how many goals he gives you if it isn't going to take any time to scoop them up, see? It's very therapeutic for a pc to write goals. I mean, they do just fine. You can sit down and say, "I wonder what's my goal?" and tear off a couple hundred and feel beautiful. It's very good. You can straighten out cases. Nothing like getting rid of a wrong goal if somebody's been run or hung with a wrong goal or something like that. You straighten it out, they really start shining.

But – oh, you get somebody off the street, raw meat, and you say, “Write me up some goals you might have had in life.” And they give you a long string of them. Gosh, they feel wonderful. They think this is great. They think this is the most. Quite interesting. Mustn't overlook that in the shuffle.

But because we didn't want to do all this Tiger Drilling by the hour and the pc didn't want all of his auditing time all devoured by it, why, I myself was rather loath to advise tremendous things. I thought I might come up with some method of copying the goal off in an awful hurry in some tricky method to avoid all this Tiger Drilling. Well, there is no method that will avoid it except find the goal, see? That avoids all further finding of goals, you see, on that particular GPM and that's the best way to avoid it, is to find the goal.

Now, the funny part of it is, supposing you went into the pc's goals list, and you read the first page of his 850 goals. Just read them, once at a time. Find out if any of them are in. One of them's in. Tiger drill it. Goes out hard, man! Don't do the second page. Don't do the second page. That case has got to be unburdened before you go any further. See the idea?

All right, now supposing we had – we took the first page, and we start tiger drilling the first page. Pc up till now has been in pretty good condition. We start tiger drilling the first page of the 850 list – dirty needle. Dirty needle. And we straighten it all up and we get the mid ruds in, we polish it all up and we read two more goals; we got a dirty needle. You might as well get off that dead horse. He's going to fall flat on his face in the middle of the pavement. That goal isn't on that list. Never seen it fail. That goal is elsewhere. You've missed it. It's not on that list. You're not going to run into it on the consecutive list of goals which you're now going to do. It's an incomplete list; it hasn't got the goal on it. So the idea of incomplete list still hangs out there.

I did a beautiful job of this one time. When we were over in Washington, I did a gorgeous job of this. I thought the pc's old goal was not the goal. Did this time after time, actually – twice, very notably – man. Found the pc's goal was not the – thought the pc's – couldn't get it to read, to react, see. So did a couple of – found an item and listed goals against the item, and goal number one on list six rocket read and did beautifully. And after some four or five hours or something like that, of – it just evaporated. It was gone! Never saw such a thing in my life, you know? It left me just bug-eyed. Because, boy, was that goal reading beautifully! I told everybody I'd found the pc's goal. Well, I had, actually, but hadn't realized it.

Pc all of a sudden – things aren't going well, needle's dirty, and you know, everything is getting goofy and so forth. But still I drilled it out and it rocket read, oh, marvelous! Couldn't get it to stay in, you know. It kept going in and out and couldn't get it to read well and most of the time it didn't rocket read. Pc all of a sudden comes up and says, “That is the end of my goal. Every goal I have put on this list – these lists for you, actually is the end phrase of my goal.” And it was, too. The pc had written nothing but modifiers for their own goal.

Fascinating.

And with that realization and using “in auditing” on the goal, using that phrasing – I today, would have prepchecked it, you see, and it would have come in faster and I wouldn't have made this error, by the way. My goodness, that goal came up and fired just gorgeously. And there it was shooting rockets all over the place, you know? And what I'd been running hard and what was rocket reading, was the last – an additional phrase that could have been on the goal, but wasn't – a sort of a modifier, only it wasn't that either. It looked like a totally independent goal all by its lonesome. You get the freaky things that'll happen when somebody has already found the pc's goal. You get that? The tail of the goal still reads but the beginning of it doesn't; but the tail of the goal isn't on the goal anyhow and you wouldn't use that to list it anyway. Oh, my! Complicated.

Anyway, as we go looking over this vista of finding goals, you can list all ten of those lists against any reliable item. You can list all ten of them against any item. You just take the *best* item the pc – come up with and list lines one and six against that best item and the pc will probably lay his goal right in your lap, see? That's after you've done an unburdening.

But how about before unburdening? How do we find out if the case has to be unburdened? Well, you take that first 850 list, read each goal once, mark those that are in, in, and go back and start tiger drilling them. Won't take you too long to do that – frankly, won't. Just going to read it once and see if it reacts. Don't miss any reads. And you'll be able to cover an awful lot of goals in an awful hurry.

Pc comes back in, gives you a whole bunch of goals, you know, they've got as a – they've got as a “tiger” oppterm, see. Give you a whole bunch of goals against a tiger. And they've got a “filibuster” as an oppterm, see, and a whole bunch of goals against a filibuster. They come in, give you this goals list and so on. There are ten goals on it. All right, fine. How long does it take you to read ten goals? None of them rocket reads and nothing upsets the needle, you can set that aside very nicely and quietly right now.

Now, here's the clue: Reading something once has minimal restimulation. You can usually give a pc an auditing command – one auditing command, without restimulating them. You can actually give them up to three without killing them. Beyond that, you're in trouble. You've started to process somebody for sure, after the third command. You are now running a process. But you can always ask them once. Therefore, you can go over a goals list and the only thing that would be hot enough to restimulate a somatic would be the pc's actual goal, in most cases, although you'll trigger somatics that are – on goals that are close to it. So watch for the somatic while you're doing the read once, see? The end of the run – if your rudiments are in and so forth – at the end of the run what have you got? You've got 40 goals out of 850. Start looking them over.

Maybe – maybe when you got up that morning you found your shoes in the right

place, you didn't get shocked while connecting up the water kettle, the car started – you know, just a wonderful lucky day. And you're reading down this list of 30 goals the pc has brought in to you and so forth and number 20 has a rocket read, and you tiger drill it up and it reads and reads and reads, and it reads every time and everything is fine. That gives you then a vast opportunity to take a crack at a lot of goals. You see the benefit of that?

Now, I'm going to give you another method of goals finding. This is another method of goals finding known as the Prepcheck. A lot of people sit around not looking. They do not look. That is their motto. And just as I told you the other day that it was very, very mysterious that a MEST Clear had been made with two consecutive Problems Intensives – it was very mysterious that this hadn't been reported from elsewhere – why, we've had another one.

They have run into a problem up at HASI London, a very bad problem, it's worrying them. After a few Problems Intensives the person keeps saying that such-and-so is his goal and they want to know what to do with it.

Well, I sent a message back to Ray up there, and told her she had to work it out, that I was tired of contributing all the time. But there was a clue, you see – there was a clue – and that was contained in 3-21. I could give her that hint.

But actually, she should have reported this, because it's only in Central Organizations now that you're getting large numbers of consecutive actions taking place. And a Prepcheck will not only produce a free needle ... They haven't noticed this in London. They notice that they're terribly loose. Making MEST Clears, you know – I mean, that – this is a killer, you know? Everybody sweating away, at it – Jim said last night, he said, “Well,” he said, “that's right.” He said, “A Clear that would not be connected with a goal wouldn't be real to me.” And he's right. He's right. You think of clearing somebody, you think of a goal. Well, how about this character who doesn't have any goal and all of a sudden he's free needle, well, that's still a type of Clear. That is the earliest type of Clear. For heaven's sakes, don't ignore it. It has all the attributes of Clear. Of course, the fellow's liable to cave in in two months or two years, or something like that and he'll be fuzzy around the edges occasionally. But for heaven's sakes don't invalidate it; it's a very valuable state, as I think somebody here could tell us.

And trying to stabilize it and get it up along the line and keep it stable and so forth requires that you find the goal and finish it off, but that doesn't say the state doesn't exist. And apparently, wherever Problems Intensives have been run with a fair degree of technical skill, and following down the line in a minimum amount of Q and A, why, apparently they're getting free needle MEST Clears. I think this is quite interesting. And you could say this and the report is not as precise as I would like it – but you could say that after three or four Problems Intensives the person may start handing you his goal. That's a new method of goal finding, isn't it?

In other words, you tiger drill the pc until the goal reads. That's another method of goals finding. Quite an amusing one. Sitting – sitting here at Saint Hill and going nowhere near a Central Organization, why, I'm finding out that they're clearing people and finding goals in a brand-new way and getting all set to use this data and all they're doing is worrying about it.

You see, some of these needles get so free that you can't read them to get the rudiments in. It's like this fellow keeps complaining, you know, he says, “You know,” he says, “every time I put some of this cracked ice in this glass

every time I put some of this cracked ice in this glass it doesn't dissolve, you know?” And you look in the glass and you find out there's a refrigerator full of perfect blue-white diamonds. And he says, “Well, it's no good – it won't cool drinks.” I mean, they're in that kind of a weird situation, apparently.

If your technical was way up in an HGC, and you weren't getting a lot of guys jumping down the throats of the pcs and they were doing all right and they were going along the line ... And apparently it's quite vital that the problem be properly assessed. The assessment of the problem is the only place they have run into trouble. They run in two or three areas. I don't know what else they did, but they have assessed the wrong problem and run it crazily and madly all over the road, see? And run a pc up the tree. That's the only dynamite contained in a Problems Intensive, is assessing the wrong problem.

But if things were done smoothly and the rudiments were put in and the pc was not Q'ed-and-A'ed with and was permitted to originate and everything went off, apparently – apparently you run enough of these Problems Intensives, twenty-five hours each, and the goal is delivered, apparently. That is what you should expect to have happen.

Now, what happens is that the needle's stuck up around 5.0, you give the person a Problems Intensive, and the needle will come down to the person's Clear read. You give them another Problems Intensive; it wobbles out one way or the other and then comes down to the Clear read again, and the needle is very floaty, and you give him another Problems Intensive, you see, and the needle stops reading properly on the rudiment so that you really need another meter or something because you can't just read through these free needles. No use for them, you know? And instead of telling the poor Joe he's a MEST Clear, you start nagging him and nattering at him, “What do you mean? You're fixing it up so your rudiments can't be checked out. You can't be checked out for missed withholds and so forth.” Apparently you give about four or five of these things and you – Problems Intensives – and the guy starts putting his goal in your lap, you know? “Yeah well, this is my goal. Now, what do I ... I'

And the auditor says, “Well, what the hell are you doing offering me that? I've got nothing to do with that. You just go on here, answer the next question.”

You can see some pc going straight up and a mile south, all ARC broke.

The auditor wouldn't listen to the fact that it was his goal, wouldn't put – even put it down in the auditor's report, you know? Director of Processing would have nothing to do with the pc because he wouldn't answer the auditing question, he'd just sat there and argued all the time about this thing being his goal. Can't read the meter because the meter has a fairly free needle except for these spurt reads! I mean. . . Oh, you could just imagine this poor organization. I mean, they're just in trouble from one end to the other. These diamonds won't cool their drinks. It's very amusing.

Anyhow – anyhow, that opens the door to another way to find goals. And this would be about the happiest way to find goals that anybody ever heard of Just – you just keep delivering Problems Intensives until the guy volunteers his goal. Pretty wild, huh? Must be valid because that's what's happening in an HGC right now, see?

I don't know if all cases would do this or not, but I don't know if all cases would uniformly sit down and be audited in an auditing chair. But the point – the point I'm making here is maybe if we added to this some Routine 2 – remember old Routine 2? Very badly neglected now. But supposing we added a Routine 2 button or two to this. It would certainly happen the person certainly would go Clear, added into the normal buttons that you use in your Problems Intensive. I know that would happen, because I've already seen Routine 2 going on down in this direction. It's just rather lengthy and auditors had an awful time finding the right level, and we didn't at that particular time have a problem – have an Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale. But now that you've got “Roll Your Own,” Routine 2 becomes a rather fantastic activity. See, so it forecasts there that there's another zone of operation. But still, the best form to use it in would be the form of the Problems Intensive. That is still your best form.

Now, there's only one thing I know of that's wrong with a Problems Intensive. On the *Queen Elizabeth*, Reg was trying to assess me to find out a self-determined change. And I looked it over very clear-eyed and clearheadedly and finally determined that, I think, twice in this lifetime I myself had independently, without further guidance, made up my mind, twice in this lifetime. The – I find two points which were purely and completely self-determined changes. I went over this rather long, and looked them all over very, very closely and very carefully. And therefore I can assume that most pcs are answering this question fallaciously and realize that the Problems Intensive has a trick built into it. And realized at that time that it had a trick built into it. And the trick is that you expect the pc to give you a change which he believes to be self-determined and then you find the prior confusion and the determination for that change. See?

That's a trick assessment. But while he was trying to find one of these on me, he kept asking me the question and I kept telling him the truth, see? So we finally wound up with the fact that there were two of these. That's pretty good in one lifetime, I found two times I'd made up my mind totally independently and uninfluencedly. Of course, I took the severe

definition of the auditing question. He asked me for self-determined changes and I gave him two, after about two hours, I forget what it was, something like that. We were able to find two.

So there's probably something wrong with the question. And the question probably shouldn't be asked with a trick to it. Now, I've been meaning to put out a bulletin or something and do something about this ever since. There shouldn't be a trick in that assessment, since the assessment becomes that vital. Probably should just be asking a person for changes.

Now, the reason we were saying "self-determined" changes before, and emphasizing that, is because we didn't want to run them into engrams. But in actual fact a Problems Intensive will run a person through and out of engrams. I mean, the button collection now has gotten sufficiently powerful to do some rather wonderful things with his track, you see? And he's not going to get stuck in an engram anyhow, if he doesn't have a missed withhold.

You want to know why pcs suddenly curl up in a ball while you're tiger drilling them sometimes and go into the engram – and it'll happen to you sooner or later – pc just has a missed withhold, and instead of going on and butchering the pc through the engram you should ask the pc for the missed withhold. Get the missed withhold and he'll come right out of the dramatization, which is quite interesting. That's – we've done that around here quite a bit, to our great advantage. It's the missed withhold that pulls him back into the solidity of the picture.

You get some auditors – all the pc's got to say, "I've got a stuck picture in front of me," and the auditor's going to run it, man. Of course, he hasn't got a prayer of running it, because it's the confusion that occurred before the stuck picture that causes the picture to be stuck, you know? But even asking for the confusion that went ahead of the stuck picture isn't good enough to release that engram. You have to run a whole series of assorted buttons on it.

But if the pc started to dramatize an operation or an incident or a prenatal or something like this, don't keep charging him on through it. Also don't suddenly change the process just because he starts shivering – that's very bad auditing. But let's say the pc curls up in the ball, and goes into a catatonic *bluhh* state and so forth. Well, you're justified in shifting off to the random rudiment and back into the process, see? That'd be your only shift, which is all part of Model Session. You're not doing something very different, you're just getting your random rudiment in.

You get your random rudiment in on a dramatizing pc in a session, he generally will drop right out of it. That's well worth knowing, because I hadn't realized till Jim was talking last night ... He didn't have this answer; Mary Sue told him what the score was on it. But he'd been tiger drilling a pc up in London; the pc curled up in a ball and went straight into a prenatal. And this was quite startling. But actually could only – so, it refreshes some earlier data which we had on this. Pc'll only dramatize like mad if he has a missed withhold. Because,

of course, his effort to withhold from the session, or with – you know, keys his going into the incident. See, he actually can't stay in the session and he retreats into the incident, don't you see? It's the withhold that pulls him back into the incident, if you can figure it out – very elementary.

Anyhow, to give you a clue as to your Problems Intensive, use of, the assessment undoubtedly should be based on a question which simply gets the person changes in a person's life. And you start asking for too many vagaries on this, see, self-determined changes, he starts answering the question absolute, you're going to have a ball. I mean, you're not going to be able to get any. And it depends on this kind of a tricky question. But if you ask him, now, because you don't want other-determined changes, if you just ask him “Times you decided to change,” why, you probably have got it pretty close to a dead-center question. I've been meaning to tell you this for some time, when I hadn't written a bulletin on it or gotten around to it at all. Had a few other things on my mind.

And well, it – just ask him for times he decided to change, or his decisions to change; why, you'll wind up with a more reliable assessment. Because the pc doesn't have to tell you any lie then, to assess it. Of course, naturally he decided to change – the house fell in on him, you know? A bad assessment will sometimes wind you up in this kind of a situation and the tone arm won't move. It's, “Will the tone arm move?” that is the criteria of a reliable assessment. If your assessment is good, the tone arm will move. If your assessment is bad, the tone arm won't move.

So in handling Problems Intensives, or in handling auditors running them, why, just lay that point in with a small club and you'll be all set. Keep your eye on that tone arm. Right after the assessment is done, the first action's taken after the assessment is done, using that date. That tone arm doesn't move, you get that guy out of there so fast that the E-Meter turns pale, see? You get him – you get him off of that. You get another assessment quick.

In other words, you want to – you want to know if in the first twenty minutes of run on the first button if you had tone arm action. And if you didn't get tone arm action you get him the hell out of there, man. See, you have to leave – if you're running this in HGCs, you have to run this on a standing order. All right, after the assessment is done – usually done by a goal finder, or the D of P or somebody, see; a confirmation of the assessment or the assessment is done by them – and your first orders after that is, “All right. We've got this date and it's January 3rd, 1941. All right. We've got that date.” That took it the – by all the rules of the game, you see, the incident, the decision and the month before and all that. “All right. Now, go ahead and start your question on this thing. 'Since ~ so forth, and for the first twenty minutes, why, you watch your tone arm, keep your needle to center very, very carefully, and give me those tone arm reads. At the end of twenty minutes, if you have inadequate tone arm action, you come back and see me fast.” You see, that's your guarantee.

Because it's apparently only those pcs who didn't get tone arm action while running

the Problems Intensive that got into any trouble because of one. See, this is a guarantee that your pc isn't going to get into trouble running the wrong problem. So what you want to do, uniformly, is watch for tone arm motion and the rules of what is good tone arm motion and what is poor tone arm motion apply as given in an earlier bulletin.

So this is a killer as long as it's done right – a Problems Intensive is. But apparently you tiger drill the pc, and he will eventually give you a goal. Or you prepcheck the pc off the goal, and you eventually had a goal sitting in the chair. I think it's very worthwhile knowing that – that this can occur. Even if we don't know at this moment that it can occur with every case in every place, it is very interesting that we know it can occur. And by telling you in this lecture, giving you some idea of the number of goals that you could cover just by reading them all at once and marking those that were in and only tiger drilling those, relieves you from, I hope, a fear of letting the pc write goals and getting goals off the pc. I hope that relieves you to some degree.

A lot of you are asking, “Well, what do I do with the 850 goals?” Well, what do you do with them? If you're doing 3GA Criss Cross and you find a couple of items and a terminal or something like this, or you want to list the goals against the oppterm and list the goals for the terminal, get a little list like this, and you start down that list and you don't immediately have a goal smack you in the face. Well, man, you've got 850 of them sitting back on the original list. You've unburdened the case so it would ~ probably run anyway, got the guy under control, nicely. Just read the 850 list off to him; you're liable to find the goal sitting right there. Oddly enough, sizing up the pc, perhaps if you hadn't unburdened it, and you had read the 850 list of the pc, the goal wouldn't have read. See? Or if you did find it, nothing could've happened. A lot of conditions could have existed around it.

On some pc – looks pretty good, he's riding down well, and so forth – just pick up the 850 list and read it to the pc, one each. Won't take you very long to do that. Mark the ones in. The chances are you'll just be reading down the list and you'll see a rocket read. And if you got up that morning and you made the proper obeisance to the rising sun and put your necklace on right end to, there you are. And you say, “To catch catfish” – pow! “To catch catfish” – pow! “To catch catfish” – pow! You see it 90 pow again and say, “What'd you think of?” He says, “To catch catfish.” Take it down to the Instructor, pc sits there calmly, Instructor says, “To catch catfish,” and there it goes. “To catch catfish. To catch catfish.” It reads – rocket reads. Bring it back. List it for sixteen hours. The pc goes Clear, find his second goal; it's number two on the list. You can do this too!

Okay. Well, I hope that's – will be of some assistance to you. Okay.

Good night.