

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: TIGER DRILLING, CLEARS

A lecture given on 22 November 1962

Thank you.

Well, we have a – what's the date?

Audience: 22nd.

Twenty-second. Of what?

Audience: November.

Gee, you're in present time! Twenty-second of November, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture one.

It hasn't been officially announced and you might not have seen the Mark V, but this is the Mark V E-Meter. And all in its pristine gray. It requires astronaut training to run this one. But this is a smasher and has nothing to do with a sales pitch; this is not a television commercial.

But we can't ship meters into the United States. And if you're getting out of here and if there is a Mark V available and you're going back to the States, you'd better take one. Because the FDA has now got several departments of mental – ha! – health. Interesting, isn't it, that the US government is going in very heavily for mental health with exclamation points. But by “mental health” they mean the electric shock machine, psychiatric incarceration instead of prison punishment. It had nothing to do with mental health at all. But they're very, very active.

And there's some organization called the HEW – H-E-W – it's brand-new to me, Health and Education and Welfare, I think it must stand for, but it certainly sounds like *HEW* to me! The Washington organization's going round and round with these characters and we won't drive them into the hole – we'll drive them way down in the hole and then we'll pound the hole in on top of them because we're tired of them. We lick them, left and right. But they never learn! They just never learn. They never learn. We're bad people to attack.

But it's quite interesting to me that the color and tenure and aspects of the United

States are changing very, very rapidly and going over in the direction of superthought police-type think, you know? And I hate to see it go that way because it just means a little more work for us and we'll have to pound them in their hole and pound them down deep in the hole and then pound the PERIOD TIGER DRILLING CLEARS hole in on top of them and we will do so. I hate to have to even bring up the subject – particularly in front of ladies!

Well, we've got quite a bit of stuff and agenda here. Now, I put a notice on the board. This is a question lecture here, this hour, and I put a notice on the board that they had to be legible – written and legible. So, if your question doesn't get answered, I couldn't read it.

And first question is, is “Will Mark Vs be available to anyone who wants one?” Oh, well, why not. You can't do very much about it one way or the other. As far as controlling the meter is concerned, when you control a meter you control nothing. That's not a good point of control in Scientology. They can be built all over the place. The thing is a hundred years old. I mean, they've been monkeying with the Wheatstone bridge for a hundred years.

We have copyrights and patents on these meter circuits and nobody can put one together like this. But they can still get kids' toys and toy lie detectors and junk like this and you actually can't control from the point or area of meter. Where you control from is copyrights and registered marks and that sort of thing. Yeah, anybody can have a meter.

My motto is, is if they're that ambitious, let them get in trouble and they'll have to go to an Academy and learn how. Okay.

“What pcs do you audit when doing research auditing and what time do you do research auditing? This has puzzled me for quite a time.” Puzzled me, too!

Research auditing: I learned quite a bit from being audited – have across the ages – otherwise I'd have no subjective reality on what we were doing at all. I'm a rather easy audit. But the research auditing which I do are divided into two classes: One is pcs I directly audit and pcs I indirectly audit. And I normally will get some auditor – you, amongst you here, have done some research auditing – for me. I have told you to do a certain thing and then I've sort of watched the lines to make sure that it was going all right and then it has come up to an end and I've decided something about that. Not necessarily experimental, but it is to prove a point or to prove some oblique point.

For instance, Williams was used as a research pc. I think he knew it at the time. At the time, no better goals action was in prospect – he wasn't getting very far – and I had a list of “Who are you?” and “Who opposes you?” and so forth, listed on him for a very long time, just wondering if you could totally bypass a goal. He will tell you that it did him some good and anybody who wanted to get some items on his case could take that old list and they'd undoubtedly find some things that slammed on it. I'm sure it didn't louse him up particularly, but it showed us that we – it was pretty certain that you couldn't just list straight items

through to Clear.

My own auditing – I was auditing on a research line; audited Reg going over to America – but this is partially research auditing and partially just trying to give somebody a hand, you see?

I keep up with all modern techniques. That is to say, anything that you're using now, I am using. Any type of session you are using, I am using in research auditing. I try not to depart from these things. I could probably audit without using any of these things. Nevertheless, I know then what frailties you will run into. That is one of the facets of research auditing. When I run into dead ends then I know that you're running into dead ends, don't you see?

And audited three pcs in Washington in addition to one that Reg audited. He's probably forgotten Fairchild. I was testing him out for entrances. And had been auditing Mary Sue hot and heavy and hard along the 3GA Criss Cross line. Not just going in the direction of finding a goal, but in actually peeling back the items one right after the other; and will go on doing so until a goal flies up. That is a research audit proposition. Possibly I could have found her goal a long time ago, see. Found various methods of entrance.

“And when do I do this research auditing?. “

Usually from about 10:30 to about 1:30 in the morning. Answered? All right. There are other people that get audited from time to time, some of them know it and some don't.

Your case reports are always of assistance, always of assistance. Particularly it tells me what you can do successfully. That is what I watch that for. I seldom bluntly assign something new or strange to be done, but I want to know if you can get results with what you're using. And when I see that too many auditors are not getting results with what they're using, why, I then do something drastic about it.

That is another entire, different channel of research, by the way, is: What can an auditor do, what will he use and what results can he obtain? Now, that is an entirely separate thing. I've never kidded myself about that at all. And one of the reasons we've made success is just because I can make a technique work or just because I have a theory, I don't ever classify that as true at all. Never do.

Most scientific research is team research. It is done mostly by cross-coordination of records. Modern research all has a certain pattern. It's done by cross-coordination of records, it's done by various – following various lines through. It's a very expensive procedure and basically we can't afford it. And perhaps if we had fifteen or twenty billion dollars, why, we'd be almost as far as we are now. We don't do that type of research.

What we're doing is a research line which is directly empirical, but we will be able to achieve a result and then we try to broaden the number of people that result can be achieved

on and then try to get it into some form so that an auditor can and will apply it and will be able to achieve that result himself. And those are about the steps which it ordinarily would take.

And the auditor is always a quotient in this. He's always a factor. If I had two or three bugs, as practically every research scientist on Earth has, we would be nowhere. And amongst those bugs is scarcity of theory. A theory is something valuable; a theory is something you get down and worship, particularly if you yourself have thought of it, you see? And he says, marvelous theory, and then you do nothing the rest of your life but peddle this theory, you see?

Man, I can think up more theories and throw them out more windows than we've got. Never hold on to a theory, never hold on to a technology if it appears weak. Just dream up another one, go along another line.

This way, you see research being done over a period of a dozen or fifteen years – the concentrated research of Dianetics and Scientology, which – I don't know, is possibly two or three hundred year development, maybe two or three thousand, as far as I know. But it's quite rapid. And that's the basis of why the research is rapid, is I have no enamorment of theories. If a theory is right, marvelous. But it is never so right that it can't be wrong and it certainly – there's no slightest desire to hold onto it. And then I don't give a damn whether people think I'm a good research man or not, see? I just couldn't care less. The only thing I'm interested in is a result – a result.

The whole woof and warp of Dianetics and Scientology is on the basis of “Does it work?” And it's the result that counts. No aggrandizement or anything else. The only time you'll hear me kick is when I've developed something and somebody else puts it out with an alter-is. Because then they, to some degree, have made me guilty of lousing somebody up at the other end and I squawk on that. You notice medicine in the United States has now adapted themselves over into early Dianetics. They're in the earliest of early Dianetics and they don't know quite where they're going.

Now, that's about the speed of Earth research. Somebody has dreamed up something and then in a dozen or fifteen years somebody else takes an alter-ised version of it and you start hearing something about it. And do you know where they've progressed to?

Well, they're not consecutively up to Dianetics. They haven't really started reading the first book, see? But they – I'm not even being funny now – they've now realized that silence is necessary in the operating room. But they are not willing to practice it. Now, there's where they are. They have already accepted prenatals as a spectacular action. And this has taken how many years? It's taken a dozen years, see?

All right now, just realize that that was probably the developmental span in Dianetics

of a couple of weeks. See? All right. Now, therefore, one week equals six years or something like that and you'll about have the difference of research actions – the difference of time ratio in them. The way I'm doing research is, let us say, the week and the way they're doing research is about six years.

Now, that works a hardship on auditors. That works a hardship on auditors. I'm very well aware of this and often very ashamed of it. I have to junk something that you're getting results with, see? I give you a new curve, I give you something up front, something more distant than that, you're perfectly happy. This class would be perfectly happy today if we had nothing more than I gave you just before I left for America, on 3GA Criss Cross, you see. You'd still be sweating around on this and you'd still be finding some goals and it'd be all right. You'd muck it through somehow or another. Well, I gave you tremendous extensions on this, see?

Well, it has a tendency to overwhelm you slightly with data. But if you understood why this is happening and the rate of advance – if you understood those things – then you wouldn't feel so overwhelmed. I won't be happy in cutting off intensive research on clearing until you can sit down and find somebody's goal with great speed and great accuracy, do you see? And right now we're dealing with something that's just a little bit tough for an auditor. I recognize we're dealing in 3A-GA Criss Cross with something that's just a little bit too hard. You're making mistakes, see, and it's taking you a little bit long. But I'm confident that you'll get the hang of it.

The main things you're doing wrong is just not completing lists. And I told you to dig out those lists and you didn't. Give her a flunk – flunk her. I wanted to show you a right list and a wrong list. Let me show you that right now, regardless of these questions. I must get this across to you. Particularly you guys that are departing – you're liable to make some horrible mistakes.

Here's an item. This is an item. And this is another item. This is another item. This is another item. This is another item, see?

This is a list, this is a roll-your-own, this is any kind of an item, see? Any kind of a list you're making for assessment, see? Well, I opened one of your folders the other day – yours. And I thought, “Oh, my God!” you know? “Oh, ha! How can anybody do this?” You know what this list looked like?

Lists don't look like that! That's an incomplete list. Just the symptom of these things on it; it's incomplete. What are you doing? See? Why are you pursuing it? Or it's coming from the wrong source. You've got no business listing this line anyhow.

When you listed the line you got no TA action. Why'd you keep on listing the line? Any list has got to give you TA action – except the goals list. Oddly enough the goals list is

completely in reverse. A goals list that gives you TA action is incomplete – goal isn't on it.

When you're nulling a goals list and you get TA action, knock it off and find some items. There's a fast tip for you. Now, I'll show you how this thing ought to look, if I can get this apart without collapsing the place. Now, this is something on this order.

Now – I'll show you how one of these things ought to look. It's very simple. Here's your list, here's your item. You know, your item of lists, something like that, see.

Now, this is the page on which the item was found. You got that now? This is the page on which it was found. So, you can understand how much less the other pages are. It looks like this. That's the way it looks.

Your lists look like that? Well, if they don't, you're listing an incomplete list. That thunderstruck some of you, didn't it? Well, if that – if you're listing and your final page doesn't look like that – remember you're tiger drilling these days – see? I'll give you this, I'll be very sweet to you and give you this. And if your final page doesn't look pretty much like that, why, the list was not complete or you weren't listing from a proper source. I've upset some of you, haven't I? Nobody dares say “yes,” because I'd know at once – I know already!

You know, that on an absolutely complete – complete list that has got the item on it and so forth – and with the pc listing from the exact right line and mid ruds in – pc in good ARC with the auditor – the auditor auditing the pc in front of him, not auditing for the Instructor. You know that just page after page of this stuff goes out. It just goes out. You read it once. You don't say “44committing overts against” or anything. You just read it once and it's out, once and it's out and once and it's out – it's out, it's out, it's out, it's out, it's out, it's out, it's out – there's one in.

Now, your mid ruds go out – all of a sudden you see something like this: In, in, in, in. “Oh.” You say, “*Uh-uh-uh, oh-oh-oh, whoa-whoa-whoa-whoa-whoa-whoooooo!*” You say, “What'd you think about?”

He says, “Oh, nothing, except that first one up there, I realized that was silly.”

And you say, “Okay. Thank you very much.” Read the first one again, it's out, out, out, out, out, out, out. You wind up with eight, nine, ten in, out of about a hundred. And then they go out, out, out. You've got about four in; tiger drill them – rapid Tiger Drill.

And I noticed you doing something the other night that you must not do. Tiger Drill is Tiger Drill – Tiger Drill is Tiger Drill. It has never been modified. The original drill is just as it is in the bulletin you'll get there – you'll get there. Now, if you want to polish this up and get fancy, why, add Careful of; and if you want to polish it up and get fancier, add the Protest. And you've got what passes for Tiger. But actually, the basic Tiger Drill is just the basic Tiger Drill and runs something like this: You read the thing and it fires so you say, “Invalidate.” You read the thing, it doesn't fire so you say, “Suppress.”

Now, you don't prepcheck Suppress, is what I'm getting around to, see? You don't do anything with it. A Tiger Drill is a Tiger Drill, you understand?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Anytime else you strike Suppress – mid ruds, you strike it in the mid ruds, you strike it in Prepchecking – and you want to make sure because this is a very suppressive pc. This is a very unusual circumstance. You know, they're very suppressive pcs so we're going to do it while we're trying to get items out, you understand? That's unusual. As you're going down the list you say, “To catch catfish.” Reads. “On this goal has anything been invalidated?”

See? Gives you the answer; you say, “To catch catfish.” It doesn't read. You say, “On this goal has anything been suppressed?” Doesn't read, you say, “Thank you, that's out.”

Tiger Drill is just Tiger Drill, you understand? That's how you get these items out. And that's why you're going down the line and just sweating yourself silly, you know? You're taking five, ten minutes to tiger drill one of these things out, you know?

It says, “cowboy,” see. “Cowboy” reads. “On this goal has anything been invalidated?” No tick. “On this goal has anything been suggested?” See? “On this goal has a mistake been made?” – or, “On this item has a mistake been made?” rather. Pang! Reads. “What was the mistake?”

“Well, you said so-and-so and I said so-and-so.”

“Thank you very much.” Read the goal again – don't even read “mistake” again, see? Why waste the extra read? Why test it?

You say, “Cowboy.” Didn't read. “On this goal has anything been suppressed?” Didn't read, it's out. You understand?

Listen, anything that is in, is charged. You've read it too far. You think the charge comes from the Suppress or the Invalidate or from – you think the read comes from the “Invalidate” or “Suggest” or the “Careful of” And it doesn't. See, the read doesn't come from there. The read doesn't come because he's invalidated it.

Did it ever occur to you why, when you say to some pc something or other and you get a rock slam – one time you get a rock slam, see, just random rock slam on the list! You say, “Careful of” and you got a rock slam. Where's that from? What's that? That fades away, that washes, see? It's not in.

But on the next item he was careful of that one and he didn't get a rock slam. Did it ever occur to you to ask this burning question: How come on some items you get a rock slam, and some items you get a heavy fall and some items you don't get anything.?

Well, the pc invalidated each one. Let's say the pc said, “Oh, to hell with it,” on “a

cowboy” and “a tiger” and “a waterbuck,” see?

Well, you read “a cowboy” – it's not his item, see? And he said, “To hell with it.” It doesn't even read! So what, see?

In other words the thing has to have an underlying charge before the pc's invalidation does anything to it to give it a read. See?

So, the amount of action that your meter gets on an item is inherent in the item – not in the pc's ability to invalidate and make the meter read, see? You're going on the basis of the pc is adding charge to it. No, no.

He invalidates a rock slamming item “tiger.” You say “tiger.” *Slam, slam, slam, slam, slam.* See? “On this goal has anything been invalidated? On this item has anything been invalidated? On the item “tiger” has anything been invalidated?” – *slam, slam, slam, slam, slam, slam, slam.* Well, you had an invalidation earlier on the list, didn't you, and nothing rock slammed?

Well, so it isn't the pc's ability to rock slam that you're meeting. It's the fact that when he invalidates a rock slam – potentially rock slamming item – you'll get a rock slam. In other words, his invalidation only activates the charge that is there.

So the activation of the charge that is there is what he's doing. So naturally, you're not going to be able to clear up a really charged item. You say, “On this goal has anything been invalidated?” Pang!

“Well,” he says, “Yes, I so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so.” Well, that clears off Invalidate. But you read this item again, you say “tiger.” Pang! See?

And if it's *the* item, you're not going to get rid of it. Chances of it submerging are very slight.

Of course, you can take some goal, and just cave in on this goal and it doesn't read anymore and then prepcheck it and it reads again, and so forth. But you never – that's why it's the goal. It has – you can't completely get rid of the charge. Sometimes it disappears and sometimes it appears and it's back and forth and it never cleans up and there's always pain on it, or something like that, see.

But that's what you're reading on the meter. You're not reading the fact that Joe, a pc – by invalidation – makes a tick. You're reading that when he invalidates an item which has a tick in it, you get a tick. You get that?

Audience: Yes.

So therefore, the most cursory tiger drilling will sort out your items.

Now, you get this main item – this is the one. You can't make it go out, you see? “On

this goal,” or “On this item, has anything been invalidated?” *Pang!*

And you say, “All right, what was it?”

And he says, “So-and-so.”

“On this item has anything been invalidated?” It's gone now. You say the item again, “Tiger,” *crash!* All right.

“On this item has anything been suggested?” Tick. You get the Suggest off. “Tiger,” *crash!* See? “On this item has a mistake been made?” Tick.

“Well, I did, I thought it wasn't it.”

“All right. Good. “Tiger,” *crash!* You say, “All right.”

Now you've got to prove it up so you move upstairs with your Tiger Drilling, don't you see? Now you're going to get “Careful of,” and you're going to get “Protest,” and you're going to monkey with this thing. Next thing you know it turns on a rock slam, see, but ordinary tiger drilling of items – until you want to work something over with the Big Tiger, see? So you – what you've done is take Tiger Drilling and graded it up to Big Tiger, see? And then graded actually Big Tiger up to something horrendous. So you're still wondering what Big Tiger is.

We were talking to you about Big Tiger. You could say six buttons, with “Protest” occasionally used – Big Tiger, perfectly adequate. The original Tiger Drill is as published in the bulletin. That's little Tiger, ordinary Tiger.

And you go sweeping down that list, *crash-crash-crash-crash-crash*. Some marvelous thing happened today – where's May? Marvelous thing happened today, we had a rocket read on the goal “to catch catfish.” I mean, marvelous! I sat there and laughed. I knew sooner or later this was going to hook into somebody's goal line or something of the sort. Sure enough, the pc used to catch catfish ever since she was six.

But she was thinking of what would be the effect side. She was trying to figure out a bulletin while it was being done. What's the effect side of catching catfish? Well, to be caught by a catfish, see? And that was what was giving the rocket read. I think it's marvelous. Somebody's going to come up some day on one of these items lists and get a rock slam on “tiger.⁷²

“When is a rock slam recoverable? Am I right in understanding it is not when an item has been fully opposed and after it has been listed from, with a dwindling R/S? Would you please say more about the probable stability?”

Oh, no. When is it recoverable? Well, it – actually, it's always recoverable and you actually don't expect a rock slam to totally diminish on a very good reliable item by being

opposed and by being represented. It won't diminish.

It'll diminish, but it won't disappear. And you can always recover them.

If it was a reliable item you can always recover them. You say just, "What wouldn't you give it?" and get a couple and all of a sudden you've got your rock slam back again. You can always make these things recover providing you don't do it too often.

Now, the only thing that makes them disappear, utterly and completely is when they are paired. Now, as you know, you can't clean up a lock on a serious withhold. Let's put it this way: the guy has a basic withhold. And you're trying to run O/W on this person – the person has a basic withhold. All right. And you catch the with . . . The basic on it is when the person was eleven. You're trying to pick it off when the person was twenty-one. And it just sort of is a dirty needle mess, you see? And you never find the basic on this chain. This is this – the same structure exists whether we're using the structure currently or not, you see?

All right, similarly, you really can't get all the disturbance off of an item until you've got the disturbance off the Rock and opprock. It's going to hang forever. It won't ever completely wash. It'll submerge, it'll suppress, it'll do this. But you can take most reliable items after they've been handled and opptermed and everything – and if you were willing to put in time enough to *prepcheck* the reliable item – this is very extraordinary, you see; never would prepcheck a reliable item that is three pairs above where you're now working. You just wouldn't do it. But if you sat down and did it, you would recover the slam. That's quite interesting isn't it?

Now, it'll reduce, it'll be less charged and you can knock it out. You can kick the thing to pieces by pulling missed withholds – which you shouldn't do, by the way – you can pull missed withholds on it and it'll deintensify. You can deintensify it in numerous ways. But why do so? The best way to deintensify it is pull it right on down to the bottom of the chain. Because it isn't – hasn't gotten really enough residual charge in it to bother with. It's been opposed, it's been represented – particularly that. It isn't immediately recoverable as a rock slam; you have to work it over a little bit to get it to slam again. What do you want it to slam for?

The only time you really want one of these items to slam again is when you take a pc over from another auditor and you're suspicious of the reliability of those items – and you can get the things to slam.

Now, I don't – you should not go to the tremendous step of doing a Prepcheck on each item. That becomes silly. But you could make them slam again. Your most basic test is to make a very short list of "What wouldn't he give that thing," if it's an oppterm. And if it's a terminal, why, "What wouldn't it give," you see? You'll see the slam back. It's a very cursory test.

It frankly doesn't matter too much unless your – unless somebody has laboriously found about twelve items on some pc. Then you get the pc and you're not sure whether these were all reliable items or not – and pcs are the darnedest invalidators in the world. They're liable to tell you that these weren't the items, that they never cognited on them. You get some wild tales from pcs. You shouldn't believe them.

Because what's happened? The thing is submerged. It's done this, it's done that. They'll even invalidate them. They'll dramatize the invalidations of them. The only time you really get into trouble is when you want to list some goals! You want to start right out and list some goals, against one of these oppters.

Now, as soon as you want to do that, you're stuck, if you had to prove up every one of them. Now, the one you will now find alive is the one which is most like the opp and opprock – the Rock and opprock, see. That's just the basic pair on the chain. The one that is now alive is most like the basic pair on the chain. List goals against it and be happy. Just read all twelve items, see. One of them rock slams, see. If twelve items don't – just start down and treat it as a goals list – just do little Tiger on them. See, *pang-pang-pang-pang-pang*. All of a sudden one slams. That's good enough. You understand? Do the rest of them if you want to find out which one slammed the best. All right, you've got one now that's slamming very nicely; list goals against it. You see how you would do that?

Frankly, you will – the point is well taken – because you will take over pcs who have a complete line plot which has nothing to do with the price of fish. And one of the quickest ways you can tell them is, is the needle dirty. You take over this pc who has had ten items found and you take a look at the needle and you start to ask the pc some question or get the pc in-session; you got a dirty needle. It's going *bzz, bzzz, bzz-bzz-bzz, bzz-bzz*.

Ah, there's something wrong. There's something wrong with that plot, that's the first thing you do. And your best remedy is not to go back over and check somebody else's work but to do some effective work on it. Just find some more items. See, it's relatively unimportant, then, to prove up somebody else's plot. That's real, real weird. Also, there's another sign that I could give you, the pc will be senned up. Lots of sen. Lots of sen and a dirty needle and the pc's line plot was for the birds. Something wrong with that plot.

All right, enough of that. The next question is, “Could you please say more about the probable stability of a first-goal Clear. When next goals key in old one, expect totally different valences and so forth and a black – and a different aberration type.”

There is no study on this. I haven't even thought any study had any necessity at all. A first-goal Clear is about three goals from the basic pattern that started him out being aberrated. And actually that person will dramatize something to some degree until the third goal is listed clear. And it'll be in the same pattern line. It'll have different names and it'll have different words and different music and it won't have as much – he won't have anywhere near the

influence over the pc.

But I know a pc right now that I'm just praying the day will come when she gets her fourth goal. Because this pc is still chopping in certain directions like acid. And it's still from that first channel, you understand? That was an indifferently complete job on the first goal, an indifferently complete job on the second goal, you see. I mean, this wasn't very good work that worked this pc up there, so there's still residuals there, don't you see? And I should think to bust the whole thing up it'd be about the fourth goal. If you're going to get indifferent clearing of this particular type to blow the lot, why, you'd have to get about the fourth goal up the line, see?

Now, if the person had been very well, thoroughly brushed up and cleaned up on the second goal, why, you should sort of expect this dramatization of various sectors to cut down. But let me put it to you this way. You know how much your own or your pc's conduct changes on the finding of one item. You find one good reliable item and you're going to get some change. Well, that pc's still having some trouble in other sectors, aren't they? Yeah, that change is quite stable, it'll stay that way.

All right, now let's take the pc's first goal-cleared. Well, that's going to introduce an awful lot of difference to this pc, you know? But let me count it up for you. Let me count it up for you. The pc probably won't have a lot of physical troubles. If they exist, they will go away. But they may still exist. The pc won't be mad and choppy and violent and beyond control in certain directions. They'll just snap in those directions. Maybe before they were too apathetic to snap, see? So now they'll chop. The world around them looks much brighter, they're much more sensible and they can work their way through it much better. They're still having a hell of a time perceiving the other man – the other person over there – they're still having trouble with that.

First dynamic is almost analogous to a first-goal Clear. Doesn't matter what dynamic it was on, the first goal basically cleans up a person's concentrated worry about himself. Put it that way. And it might not be too awfully observable. Oh, people would observe it, yes, there'd be an awful difference to them, but, I mean, as far as he's concerned other people haven't changed yet and there's a lot of reservations here one way or the other. He feels stable, he feels happy, you're not trying to degrade this state. But it's a question of how far has a man got to go?

Now, if that's listed out and has given a free needle – the way you were listing now on your Routine 3-21 – I'm very sure that is very stable. Because I've seen stability increasing every time we did a better polished job of it, I've seen the stability better. That's pretty good.

But as – let's take now this fourth-goal Clear. Let's just skip those intermediate states. You realize that a fourth-goal Clear probably needs a body to talk? That's aberrated, man! I don't care how else you look at it, that's aberrated. Needs a body to talk. May still eat; that's

crazy, man! Breathes; what do you want all this drafty stuff pouring in and out all the time for? Influenced by gravity; drops his watch and it'll hit the deck-break, too. You get the relative state of affairs. You see, you're going on up there – you're up throughout the sixth dynamic. And he'll be still having trouble with the sixth dynamic. Do you get what I'm talking about? I needn't go over it in any hideous state.

I think the present stability of a first-goal Clear is absolutely remarkable. But you can get your idea of the situation this way. Get the idea of pinning your whole hopes for a complete change of this pc on getting one item blown. Get the idea of that. Now, you know how much the pc changed in getting that one item blown. Made a big difference to the pc. Something that could – that's not negligible.

Well, of course, a goal like this is astronomically greater than just the one item, see, because there are dozens and dozens of these pairs. But you can't put all your hopes on this first goal, either, see? It's always a mistake to make the big – to make one thing do it. And you're going to make this mistake sometimes when you're deintensifying a rock slammer or you're going to oppterm – they're rock slamming like mad on Scientology, see, so you're going to oppterm this and you get the oppterm, see? And this cools them off and so on. But you've put your whole stake on just this, see? And Scientology now makes them unhappy. See? They're not trying to cut it up and they don't think it's cutting them up, but it makes them unhappy, do you see? In other words, there was something left, see, and there will continue to be, until they're up there a lot of packages, and so on.

You can make an enormous change – can make an enormous change and the only thing I must warn you against is making a mistake of absolutes – believing they are obtainable. Believing that this person who is an alcoholic, after you've gotten three items off, will cease to be an alcoholic. See? He'll probably be queasy on the subject of being an alcoholic right up to the second goal. See? He'll have little moments of queasiness. He may not even tell you about them, you see. Oh, he's cured of it. He isn't doing that now. But you say, “Well, I'll cure an alcoholic. I'll just oppose alcohol and I'll get one item and then he's absolutely – never afterwards he's going to be an alcoholic.”

Well, if you compute like that, you're going to get lots of loses. Similarly, if you expect that every first-goal Clear is going to be able to fend for himself on all dynamics, you're going to get lots of loses.

Because the first-goal Clear won't fend for himself on all dynamics. Hell generally fend for himself very ba – very, very well on the first dynamic – do infinitely better. It isn't they become more first dynamicity than they were before; they just get a first dynamic. They become aware of themselves, or something like this. It's the first time this has ever happened, don't you see? Before that time, they're withholding themselves. So that's the story of stability.

As far as stability is concerned, how long will the state last? Well, boy, we've had some of these going for quite a while now. And we've had some of them checked out after the fact and so forth, and they seem to be staying remarkably stable.

A case has to be pretty well cleaned up before it stays stable. The degree of – the second goal doesn't operate as a key-in against the first-goal action. That might be something interesting to you. You sometimes are going to have trouble to get the second goal to key in so you can list it. In other words, you're going to have trouble sometimes killing that free needle.

Imagine trying to get the rudiments in on a very well cleared first-goal Clear that you can't read a meter on. The best thing to do is to get them to read a goals list because that'll key them in faster than anything else. They'll now – they won't dramatize their second goal any more than they have been, however. Dramatization doesn't increase by reason of restimulation. They just go on that way.

The speed with which the second goal cleans up is what's got me startled. I've seen several of them now and I'm just – gee! You know? Do an eight hundred and fifty goals list – just your Routine 3-21 – do an eight hundred and fifty goals list and so forth. I'd seriously doubt you'd have to do very much with items. But on the other hand on some cases you might.

I'm thinking of the case who made up his goal last century. Did you realize, I mean, that we might hit a case that the first goal was postulated in 1810, and all you've cleared is back up to 1810 and then it's free as a bird? Then the second goal is what you'd have trouble with, wouldn't it? Well, we don't know too much about that, but those are some hazardings.

All right, let's get a few more here. I think I just answered that question.

Oh, “Dwindling rock slam.” You had a hot item. “What does it signify?” You had a hot item. Don't worry about it. Sometimes you get a dwindling rock slam; sometimes you don't. And you're doing very fine, now, without finding any. So it's just a phenomenon.

Now, you could have used it before when you had a limited number of items you were going to find goals on, right? See, when you had a limited number of items you're going to find goals on, therefore, you had to find a particular kind of item in order to list goals against it, see? Well, therefore, you needed a dwindling rock slam. Well, sometimes you're going to get dwindling rock slams and sometimes you aren't. But you're not going to use them to find a goal with anyway so why bother with them?

You don't necessarily only use that you have a dwindling rock slam on to find the goal from, either. In other words, dwindling rock slam is actually a phenomenon. It now indicates that it exists. You'll see it, but if you don't get it, so what? Doesn't mean anything, doesn't mean you haven't got – you're going to get an invalid item.

But let me tell you, the line that you get that dwindles will give you a honey. You

always get a better item on a line that dwindles than a line that doesn't. That doesn't mean you should go around looking for dwindling ones because you get perfectly good ones that you have to get anyway on lines which when listed, don't dwindle. Non-dwindling lines – no dwindling rock slam on the line – give you a perfectly usable item. You understand?

“If when oppositioning a rock slamming Scientology terminal, a very persistent dirty needle turns on and the list is five hundred items long and it'll still dirty needles, and missed withholdings does not immediately remedy the condition, what should one do?”

Well, there's a missing datum here. Did the thing turn on any rock slams? If while you're listing you got some rock slams, why, you got a pretty good chance of finding an item on it. And you certainly better list the dirty needle out. But let me tell you that if it didn't turn on any rock slams – you're just going up a blind alley.

Remember that it – your nulling bulletin is absolutely correct – it must come from a fruitful source. And this particular item is not from a fruitful source. See?

There is a missing datum here – the question is unanswerable just to this degree. So a dirty needle turns on. Well, if it's from a correct source that it's going to get you an item, the dirty needle will turn into a rock slam, turn into a dirty needle and then dwindle out and vanish and you'll have a complete list and you can null it and find a rock slamming item.

Well, let's just take at random, “Who built this house?” Let's just pick one out of the air, see, and we're going to list “Who built this house?” from a PC, see? We're going to run this. It's way out of time, space. We haven't assessed for it. It makes no sense anyhow and now we're going to get a list. And let me tell you, that list will go dirty needle, dirty needle, sen, sen, sen, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, sen, more sen, dirty needle, dirty needle; needle maybe clear up. Something might rock slam for a moment

Pc's protest over the charge, see? Just an instant, you know? And – dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle – five hundred items. Dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle – six hundred items. Dirty needle, dirty needle, dirty needle – seven hundred items. Dirty needle, dirty needle. You'd better wake up! It's from nowhere. Literally and factually true.

Now, we'll run the case for a while and someday come back to the list and null the list and what do you know. We now have rock slams on it. But now the case has been unburdened.

That's a case of – that's, by the way, auditors are going to make mistakes on that, I suddenly realize. Auditors are going to make mistakes on it. They're going to do this. I myself just picked one off the PC and did a list exactly like this – and I wish I hadn't started it. But the sen dwindled. I eventually wound up with no sen on it. I listed the sen off the list, which I think is quite remarkable, but it was not a properly picked-up thing. It was just an arbitrary

test line. Sen came off of it and PC felt mighty sick listing it, but at the end of the line sen was off, pretty well – and I took items – it had R/Sed a bit here and there, once in a blue moon – and I took those and I tiger drilled the R/Sing items, and the second I did a dirty needle came back on the list. I said *ah-ah-ah-ah-ah-ah!* We're out of here, see?

Otherwise it'd looked good, see? The sen dwindled. I mean, you haven't got any sen on the pc now. And you had a rock slam in, I think, six items on this list of many, many pages – rock slammed slightly for a moment. Pc thought of them. When the pc thought of them they rock slammed. Obviously this was a very heavily charged list, but it was leading no place. At the end of something like fifteen or fourteen pages or something like this, why, still got a dirty needle on it.

What is this? What is this list? You might say it's premature. That list you ought to have been listing on after the pc has had another thirty items found, you got the idea? It's too far down the track. Pc wouldn't have any reality on it if you found it. It's not going to slam. The item that is on the list is not going to slam. It's too suppressed. It's too much in the package. It's – see, it's too early. There's too much force in it. The pc can't confront up to it. Don't you see all these things?

Therefore a great deal of good sense has to be used in choosing what lines to list. And by choosing the wrong line to list, why, of course, you get dirty needles and you get everything else and you get yourself into a lot of trouble and you get the pc into a lot of trouble and you don't know whether you're coming or going. That's listing from the wrong line.

Let's say you do a lousy Prehav assessment. Let's say you do just a *stinker* – horrible! It should have been “prevent knowing,” and you came up with “tell everybody,” see? This thing is just lousy, see? And you go in there with great ambition and you list away. This is the condition which you're going to find – just the conditions I've just described to you. You can go on and on and on. I think you could list ten thousand items on it and you would still not have listed it out. Because the item itself is not going to appear to the pc on the list. The pc will never recognize the item, even if you found it.

Supposing you had some method of finding it and handing it to the pc on a silver platter and say, “Here it is – Homo Sap.” You know? Pc would say, “It hasn't anything to do with me.”

Now, you've got the pc's goal listed down and you – case is way advanced – case can tolerate and confront a great deal much more force, you see. You've got dozens of items in addition now to this. All of a sudden, mysteriously, on the list will appear “Homo sap” and the pc will say, “That's my item.” See? That's a very premature action. Most of these wrong lines, however, give you just exactly nothing. They don't give you a dirty needle or anything. But you can get ahold of one of these lines that someday will come up on the pc, but not now. And that's the way it behaves. Okay?

All right. Time for one more before the break, huh?

The question is, “Must this pc who is listing on the goal have rock slamming items found, or could he go Clear by continued listing on the four lines?”

Answer: Pc did not go Clear with the four lines, so therefore pc must have rock slamming items found and those items must be opptermmed. The reason this pc didn't go Clear is because of *bypassed items*. Got it? He just couldn't list out to Clear, so you must have bypassed something. You have to go back and find it, okay?

I dare say some day you may be clearing that way. Them as list straight out onto Clear and so forth, you never bother to. But a case that's been listing for a while and he isn't Clear yet; somebody certainly better get interested. Okay. Aw, we've got time for one more.

“Will we be able to take meters back into the US without trouble and when will the Mark Vs be available?” Actually, Mark Vs are available – a few of them are available right now – some more of them are coming in. Edgar could tell you more about that. When are Mark Vs available, Edgar?

Male voice: Tomorrow.

Tomorrow? So there's – there's Mark Vs available. As far as taking them into the US without trouble is concerned, the people have never stopped a meter which was by surface package mail or was in somebody's paws as a personal effect. No meters have been stopped.

The only meters that have been stopped have been by air shipment and in bulk. And that's big enough for the FDA's myopic little man eye to see, and it comes in with much higher velocity than they at their state of case can tolerate. And so they're stopping those madly. You don't even have to make a point of taking a meter into the United States. The fellow says – customs is poking around and he says, “What's this?” Well, don't tell him it's a time bomb, because they've been known to arrest people just for saying it. But say, “Well, that's just a – I'm a minister – that's something which we use in confessionals.”

“Oh, is that so?”

The only trouble is, the only – that's the best way to classify it. The actually, look where the Catholic church had been if all their confessionals had been done with an E-Meter. Look at the missed withholds they must have missed. Anyhow – that probably shattered them. So it's a good explanation.

The only liability – the only liability you get into, Tom, is the fact that when you've told them this, they will probably call over a buddy who is interested in psychology and he will want to talk to you about it. Not because he wants to find out anything, but because he'd like to get out of the racket he's in. That's a fact. That happened to us the last time in New York. We almost couldn't get through customs. We were being too bothered by customs men

who wished to join the club. Expect no trouble in that direction. Tell them it's your personal property and that's a tool of the trade and you're all set. They won't say anything more about it.

Okay?

Let's take a break.