

GOALS LISTING

A lecture given on
9 August 1962

Thank you.

Well, this is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 9 August . . . What's the year?

Audience: 1962. A.D. 12.

A.D. 12. All right, thank you.

What I'm going to talk to you about is technically just listing. Listing: How to list.

In the beginning, there was the Model Session.

Now, what do you do in listing that is different than any other auditing?

Well, you prepcheck the object of and the lines of the auditing command every session beginning with a fast check. Got it? And I think if you do that, your number of items that you need to list out a goal will materially diminish. I think you'll find it saves its time over and over and over and over.

So let's put in the rudiments—the beginning rudiments—bangetybangety-bang, and say the PC's goal, and to-be-a-tiger it. In other words, get the middle ruds in on it fast. Get it to firing if we can. Of course, we go just so far, this thing is going to start firing latent, and it's going to expire one way or the other. But after all, it is our target. And to run somebody endlessly with his goal suppressed and invalidated and all that sort of thing is liable to require a large number of additional items and all kinds of other things in the session, don't you see? Other things might go wrong. You might even waste a whole session and not even recognize that you have wasted one.

All right. Now, the auditing command, of course, is the who-what lines, of which there are four.

Now, I'm not going to try to give you a wording of the who-what lines and say that it will forever and always be true.

First you have finding the goal, in 3GA, and proving it out, and then you get to listing. And in actual fact, the first step of listing is to find lines that fit the goal.

Now, you've got a picture that you must comply with. And the picture is an outflow arrow and an inflow arrow—arrows pointing at one another. Draw a circle for the PC and then draw a line going out from him and then the arrow-ends, and then draw another line extending that one, but its arrow-ends are in toward the first arrow.

And then you have the retarding arrow of the first line, and then you have the retarding arrow of the second line, and they're just arrows alongside the other two arrows—going the opposite direction. In other words, you got four arrows here: One is going out from the PC and one is going in toward the PC.

And then you've got the other pair of arrows further out; the first one is in toward the PC and the other one is out away from the PC.

Now, the auditing command that you want simply matches up the four basic flows. Now, you see, there could be 16 flows listed, there could be 32 flows listed, there could be 128 flows

listed. Don't you see? You could list and list—oh, wow! But staying with four is the most economical, as far as we know at this particular time. But those four must be meaningful to the PC; they've got to make sense to the PC.

Now, we want to know—the first line is. “Who or what would have it?” “Want it,” “have it”—I don't care which one you use. That's as far as the goal is concerned. Then “Who or what would oppose it?” See, that's your outer arrow pointing in toward the first arrow. “Who or what would oppose it?”

Now we've got to have specifically “Who or what would keep you from performing it?” or “doing it?” You see? And then we've got to find out “Who or what would oppose its being opposed?”

Now, how you get these words to go together is remarkable, and so forth, but they must fire.

Now, the goal has a rocket read, and then so must the lines. You've got to have a read on those lines. And the read on these lines must exist not because you've made a mistake on the line. You recognize that you could write the wrong line, and so forth.

Do you know, to date we have had three people, one of whose clearing was held up and two that was loused up, right here at Saint Hill, because nobody paid enough attention to the wording and value of the wording of lines? So this is not a light subject. This is a very important subject. And it is the auditor's responsibility, not the Training Director or somebody else's responsibility. This is the auditor's responsibility. Those lines are there and they've got to fire.

In other words, when you read this line, “Who or what would want to catch catfish?” that thing has got to fire on that, not because the goal is on the end, but the line as a major thought has got to fire. That's got to fire.

Now, remember that the whole rash of free needles that we got out earlier this summer were all listed on this simplicity. (I'll show you how simple it can be.) Line one: “Who or what would want to catch catfish?” (Let's say this is the goal.) Line two: “Who or what would oppose catching catfish?” Line three: “Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?” Line four: “Who or what would not want to catch catfish?”

Now, those are the exact lines—the verb form changing on two of the lines to an -ing. And look, even though they were reaching madly and having an awful time on line four, and scrambling around on it most horribly, they still made it, see? Now, it was only when, on one (and I'm not saying this just to be mean, although the person who is going to hear it in a moment will swear that I said it just to be mean)—the introduction of “your” into the line (unreported by the auditor)—into one of the lines prevented that line from ever going to free needle. Till one day I caught the thing up and found out that this extra word existed in the line, knocked the extra word out, had it prepchecked a little bit, and wham, all four lines went to free needle.

See, there was one line in there—I've forgotten which line it was, but it was something on the order of “Who or what would oppose your catching catfish?” Not “Who or what would oppose catching catfish?” See? Just the introduction of that “your” on one of the four lines. See, it wasn't on the other three. And yet this was listed this way by three auditors, see? And the first auditor was completely exonerated on the matter because nobody had formulated the lines at that time to amount to anything and we were just at the beginning of this level, and this auditor put them together as kind of what the PC thought they might be, you see? And there was a “your” in it. And that prevented those things from going to free needle. So, in other words, the wording Of the line can prevent or achieve a free needle for that line. It is the wording of the line.

Now, our more modern version seems to hit people much closer. And we have had at least one goal not go clear on the old four lines, but be much easier to run, and is running much more easily—and actually on the original four lines just went up to 6.0 as the TA, and stuck. Right goal, but it just went up and stuck because these lines were not adequate to describe the situation, you see, and started moving again the moment the wording was changed to these lines which we are now using.

Line one: “Who or what would want to catch catfish?” Line two: “Who or what would oppose catching catfish?” Line three: “Who or what would retard” (or “pull back”) “opposition to catching catfish?” And line four: “Who or what would pull back” (what is it?) “. . . from catching catfish?”

Audience: “Someone or something.”

Oh, “someone or something from catching catfish?” Now, “someone or something” could of course be on at least two of the lines, or on more of the lines, you understand. But there is the pattern which we are using now. It’s “pull back” and “pull back,” or “retard” and “pull back,” on lines three and four.

But the point is, the line has got to fire. You read the goal, “To catch catfish,” bang! “To catch catfish,” bang! “To catch catfish,” bang!

All right. That read transfers over onto all four lines. And it is not true that it transfers onto just three of the lines and the other one isn’t hot just now. See, it’s because that line that is not firing is not quite right. See? You should be able to put these four lines together and get them all to fire. You say, “To catch catfish,” bang! “To catch catfish,” bang! “To catch catfish,” bang! “Who or what would want to catch catfish?” Bang! See? They’ve all got to fire that way.

Now, there are various oddball wordings which haven’t worked. We run into the problem of the negative goal. Let’s take the goal “not to talk.” “Who or what would want not to talk?” That’s perfectly fine, isn’t it? “Who or what would oppose not to talk?” That’s good, isn’t it? That’s fine. We’re just going along fine there. Now let’s get to line three on the old wording. “Who or what would not oppose not to talk?” Double negative. Enterprising auditor, shift the double negative, of course, change it around so you don’t have a double negative, that’d make it “much better”—she never goes clear. And line four, “Who or what would not want not to talk?” That’s really becoming garbage as far as the auditor can see. Pretty gruesome.

But what do you know! Interestingly enough, it’s perfectly comprehensible to the PC. Double negative—so what? Doesn’t mean anything to the PC. The line means something to the PC, but that it isn’t grammatically something or other was not a thing. So that first wording was perfectly okay and was all right to remain just as it was, if you had a negative goal.

But this wording didn’t work, see—double negative, that’s all right, doesn’t matter. But this wording didn’t work: “Who or what would want the goal ‘not to talk?’” “Who or what would oppose the goal ‘not to tally?’” “Who or what would not oppose the goal ‘not to talk?’” For some cockeyed reason it ceases to make sense very soon, see? “The goal...” “the goal...” “the goal . . .” Makes it grammatical, but apparently makes it unworkable.

Now we’ll get another one: Let’s take the wing out of it. “Who or what would oppose catching catfish?” See? “Who or what would oppose the goal ‘to catch catfish?’” Now, this one is important for you to know about, because PCs will try to steer you into it. It hasn’t the least bearing on the situation. It doesn’t go clear. Apparently this one lays an egg. But a PC tells you that’s real hot. The PC will tell you “That’s real good.” And apparently it is for the birds. See the difference? It’s a different meaning. “Who or what would oppose the goal ‘to catch catfish?’” of course is just dandy. That sounds good, doesn’t it? Well, it isn’t the same meaning that you want on your list line.

We don't care about opposing the goal. To hell with the goal—why keep it in that realm? We want to know who would oppose catching catfish, not oppose the goal “to catch catfish.” It's “Who or what would oppose catching catfish?” that clears the PC. See, that's the opposition. It's the opposition to action. Because remember, these are flow lines. When anybody tries to steer you away from a wording which you think is proper and so forth, in arguing it out with a PC, or figuring it out yourself or something, just remember this: These are actions. These are actions.

Now, of course, we get “want the goal”: that's a kind of an inflow, isn't it? And that has always kind of loused me up. I don't know quite why an inflow word like want works as an outflow action of the goal. But it apparently keeps the goal in the item's head that has got it. See? But hale, as far as I know— although I don't have too much data on this—have apparently works equally well. Apparently.

But it's what fires that counts. But what fires has got to be actions of the goal. It's got to be action. Because you're listing flow lines.

So this would be dead wrong: “Who or what would oppose people who had the goal to catch catfish?” That's dead wrong. You want to know who or what would oppose people. Well, that's not the goal.

All right. Let's go a little bit further afield here. It's after all catfish, isn't it? All right, so “Who or what would oppose catfish?” You're practically listing two lines at once. That's what messes up there. Because anybody who's trying to catch catfish is opposing catfish too. And anybody who's opposing catfish is also opposing catfish, and you've got no opposition anyplace. So you might as well just do the one line for the two; don't you see?

And there we come into the liability of listing lines. Now, believe me, this is quite a problem, because you're liable to make this horrible mistake, unless forewarned: The PC is given four commands but actually only lists three lines. Now, look at the mess this gets him into. He lists twice as many items on one line and he lists no items on another line, and an equal number on the remaining two lines.

In other words, he overlists one line and doesn't list another line at all. And the PC is going to go round the bend. See, he's really going to get cooked with this one. Next thing you know, your tone arm is stuck, and you'll be saying it's the wrong goal, and everything is all upset. Well, the PC, through his own interpretation, can do this just fine. So the best way to handle this is have PCs draw you pictures.

Now, you want to draw the PC a picture of the one I just gave you and present this as a problem to the PC of how you're going to word this thing. Of course, you're going to word this thing with current wording. If absolutely impossible, you're going to change it. But you're going to try to word it with current wording. But you want to show the PC this thing. And it's this arrow that comes in toward him, and this arrow that goes out that faces the other arrow, and then this arrow that pulls back and then this arrow that goes out parallel to the other one. You want to show him those four arrows, and you're going to say, “That's oppose. That's opposed to doing your goal, and this is doing your goal, see, and this is keeping you from doing your goal, don't you see, and that's retarding the other Tom being opposed. But at the same time, we don't want this fourth line here to be the second line up here. Do you see how that could be? See, who would oppose you doing your goal? And who would not want you to do your goal?” Ooooh, those things are getting awful ghostly close together, aren't they?

You got to have wording here that means these four flows, with regard to the action of this goal.

Now, goals Are action situations. Even “being a hound dog,” as a goal— “to be a hound dog,” see—requires an action. The action is at least to be. That's not much action, but it's still enough action to be action and it causes a Dow. You say, “Who would want to be a hound dog?” and

of course now you've got it pretty well made. Of course, there's some action a little bit added in there. And "not want to be a hound dog," see? You could get these things, you see, but they're still actions. "Oppose being a hound dog," that's guaranteeing action, you see? And "retard opposition to being a hound dog."

These are very hard for PCs to wrap their wits around very often. Particularly when they're lying at the bottom of the GPM. There they lie, nobody has disturbed them on this subject for millennia, you see, or triennia. Nobody's even breathed it at them or mentioned it to them, and you all of a sudden come along and propound the philosophic principle of whether or not they're going to oppose or not oppose being a hound dog, you know? They've just never considered it. They'll be in this kind of a state: They know that everybody opposes being a hound dog. And that is the "truth." That isn't a fact, you see; that's the "truth." The truth of life: Life opposes being a hound dog.

Now, you introduce a brand-new idea: You say, "Who would want to be a hound dog?"

"Want to be a hound dog?" Good heavens, nobody's thought of that, you see !

Well, factually they haven't thought of it for ages. See? And these other actions, the other three actions . . . So they very readily steer themselves over onto one groove, if they possibly can, and it'll be the flow they happen to be stuck on at the moment you get them to figure it out.

So their advice is worse than useless. But you want to find out whether or not they can answer it. That's what you want to know. That's why you consult them. You don't take their wording, but you want to find out if they can answer it. And then you juggle the wording around or do anything you have to do to the wording so that you can clear, you know, invalidation, mistake, wrong word, anything like that that you want to clear on this thing. And after this line is cleaned up with a fast check on the mid ruds, like to-be-a-tiger drill—after this line is cleaned up, brrrrp, see—you say that line and you get pow! You get a read, see? You say the line, you get a read. You say the line, you get a read. Dandy. Here we go. That's fine, see?

Now you want to get the next one, so that when you say that line you get a read. Say the line, get a read. Prepcheck it out. In other words, you mid-rud the thing. You see, you get those mid ruds in on the line, and then test it. You'd be surprised how busy they are sometimes in invalidating lines, and all that straighten-out.

So frankly, I've opened up a subject to you, you possibly haven't looked at very intimately, and that is the wording of a line to be listed. But that, second to the goal, is the most important source from which all clearing flows—is that line. And now, keeping an even balance amongst those lines as they list.

All right. Now, so much for this wording of the line. Your next step is to make sure that as you list, you list in Model Session, your rudiments are in without antagonizing the PC unduly—because, you see, you can put the rudiments in so often that it amounts to no auditing, and then the rudiments go out, see?

So your basic action is don't list too long on one line. How long is too long? I'll tell you exactly how long you should list a line, exactly how long: as long as the flow in that direction persists.

Yeah, how are you going to know that? Well, short of an oscilloscope, you're not. An oscilloscope will show you the flow line. So you just pays your money and you takes your chance.

But I'll give you an indicator. This would be slightly overlisting a line, but would be safe. This is slightly overlisting the line by an item or two, but it's very safe: As soon as the PC says "Uh . . . and uhhhh . . .," change your lines. Go to the next line. Why? You've hit the null point.

You see, don't be under the delusion that the PC is thinking up these items. Don't make that mistake. He thinks he's thinking; he thinks he's talking; he thinks it's all going off, but actually he's just a wound-up doll. See, he's just firing off . . . He couldn't help it. He practically couldn't help but give you the items, because they're being dealt. See? Because they're stacked in the GPM in that way. He doesn't think of any of them.

Now, if a PC is groping for the right wording, you've overlisted. "I mean a . . . uh . . . I mean a . . . uh . . . uh . . . mm . . . Oh, no, that isn't the right word. Uh . . . uh . . . a uh . . . a big . . . a big . . . uh . . . no, a big, big . . . a huge . . . uh . . . uh . . . a gargantuan . . . Uh . . . a tr—tr—uh, let's see, a tremendously . . . no, that isn't . . . uh, tremendously large . . ." Oh, man, you overlisted a long way back. You should have quit, see?

Now, that item will spew onto the paper, bang! Just without any trouble from the PC. And long times in listing sessions without many items coming onto the page is all caused by the auditor not judging the flows right. Comm lag of the PC eats up session. And if you keep the PC out of that comm lag—you just list in rotation: one, two, three, four; one, two, three, four; one, two, three, four; and don't let the PC comm lag, or shut off an automaticity.

Isn't that neat? You mustn't shut off a PC's automaticity. He's saying, "Tiger, waterbuck, water buffalo, uh . . . big snakes, pythons, uh . . . Mindoro uh . . . natives, pygmies, uh . . . pygmies, pygmies, uh . . . uh...."

Well, the funny part of it is, is you mustn't have shut him off at "water buffalo," because it'd suppress the next two items. He can't help but say them, don't you see? They're just being dealt off the top of the deck, one-two-three-four, see? They're just coming right on up, one-two-three-four-five-six-seven-eight-nine-ten-eleven, tr-tra-nun-nun, and then "a . . . a . . . uh . . ." Shift lines.

Now, I'll tell you when you've listed too long, slightly, but not to the other degree "I can't get the right word for it. I don't know what . . ." Oh, you're way overdue, man! You missed the 5:15, you missed the 6:20, see, you missed the midnight express. No, here's the one: The PC says, "No, that's not it." You've gone over. You've gone over, right now.

He's invalidating the item he is giving you. Why is he invalidating the item he has given you? Because the other flow line is now meeting the direction of his attention and is overwhelming his attention so that any item he thinks up is of course being overwhelmed by the other flow line coming to him. Just like that, heh! It's very neat.

And you just listen to him, as he goes along on listing, and he says, "A water buffalo, a tiger, a Mindoro native, a pygmy, a uh . . . uh . . . uh . . . uh.. .ap-python, auh...um.. .uh. .uh...a.. .a deer. No. No. No, that's not it. Um . . . a uh . . . buck. A buck . . . uh—no, no, um . . . a buck, uh . . . No. No, not a—not—not—not a—not a buck deer. Uh . . . um . . . let's see, now. Um . . . Well, I c-ca-can't really think of the name of the thing. Uh . . . uh . . . a big . . . uh . . . a buck, uh . . . uh . . . uh . . . a v . . . a very lar—uh . . . It's a certain kind of a deer they have down in Mindoro, a uh . . . a dak, or u . . . u . . ." Oh man, you missed the 6:15, the 8:30, the 10:25 they've all gone by. See? That's the whole gamut. You have run the lot now, see?

Your first indicator was "and a uh...." Well, out of courtesy, you could let him give it to you. He'll say, " . . . a uh . . . buck."

And you say, "All right. Thank you very much. Thank you so much. Now, all right, we're going to start on the next line. And here we go." We've shifted gears, and we're now listing on something else.

That's really the way to get away from the pin fast, and your PC doesn't get suppressions, and you don't have to put in the mid ruds all the time and all that sort of thing. Just catch it on that first "ahh . . ." And it's just handed to you on a silver platter.

He tells you. “This line has run as far as it’s going to go, and is now in an eddy area, and is about to turn around and go the opposite direction.” That’s what he tells you with that “ahh....” With the invalidation, he tells you, “It has already turned around and is going in the opposite direction, and anything I think of is being overwhelmed and invalidated by the line which is now coming the other way.” See? And when he can’t think of it at all, he’s just totally overwhumped. Now the line is really racing at him.

But similarly—let me make this point again—it is a high crime to shut off an automaticity because he won't be able to get it again. This thing is firing off and you put a suppression right on the middle of the thing. He's going to tell you all of a sudden thirty items—
 brrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr.

And you say, “Well, that’s enough.”

He says, “Bu-bu brrr-b-br—brrrr. . .” And you put in the mid ruds at that point, you find it was all suppressed. The PC feels kind of loused up. He feels kind of betrayed and so on.

So there are the basic tricks of listing: (1) At the beginning of the session get in your rudiments. (2) Get your goal fast-checked. (3) Now, there's two ways you could go about this: One is simply to fast-check the first line you do, and then when you get to the next line give it a fast check; when you get to the next line give it a fast check—first time you ask it, you see? You get to the fourth line, give it a fast check and then don't check them anymore. Just see if it fires, that's the only thing you want. It's very fast. See? That could be done that way, or you could take all five of these things—the goal and the lines—and just read them all off to see if they all fire, see if there are any suppressions on them, you know. And clean them up, bang-bang, get them all firing, bong, and then go on to your session. Two ways you could go about this. Find out which one is best for you.

Now, you center his attention on the lines, of course, too solidly, in prepchecking the things, and he'll start giving you answers, then you're already in session. So that has some liability connected with it.

Now, your next action is to get the PC to list the first line down to a point where he says “And a ... uh ... uh ... let me see....” Let him see by all means. But if he sees for more than a few seconds you say, “Well, all right. That’s fine. We’ll get that one the next time we come around. Now, let’s start on this next line,” see? Let’s not leave him in thin air. And just list to the comm lag. Go straight along down the line. List to the comm lag. List to the comm lag. List to the comm lag.

Now, you're going to get in trouble sooner or later because your lines are going to get ragged if you list to the comm lag. And that's liable to upset you. So you take one of those times when he's feeling very, very easy, and catch up a few items. And it's a nice balance which you do. But if it's straining him to think of any more items just to make you catch up, you abandon catching up. You got it? Because it's not a quantitative process, after all. It's the amount of now, see? It's the amount of now that we're interested in, not the number of items. And number of items is merely an approximation of keeping them level. That is a sloppy index of how much flow has been gotten off any one of these lines.

As far as checking the mid ruds is concerned, every time you turn around, you won't have to do it if you list this way, which makes for very fast listing. But if you make yourself a bunch of mistakes—this is really when to use the mid ruds, a fast check of the mid ruds, not a repetitive check. If you make a big mistake, and this PC is going brrrrrr, and you say “Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much! Yeah, thank you! Yeah, thank you! Yeah, well I got that! Now, is there any other item that—a person or being there that would want to catch catfish?” And the PC is sitting there looking blanched, you know? He's been struck dead. He's halfway through an automaticity, and he can't get it out.

Actually, recognize what's happened to him. You've suppressed thirty or forty items, just like that. Bang! You didn't quite see what you were doing, you know? You didn't realize he was running off an automaticity and it was just tearing right on down the line, and you all of a sudden gave him a nice Tone 40 acknowledgment, see? Brought him into present time, put him into the session, crash, you see, all that sort of thing, and you just smell the rubber burning.

You make a goof like that, don't let him yap or get upset about it, just get in your mid ruds. Suppress—man, that is really going to be hot. You made him suppress the lot. Get the idea?

Or, if you were kind of sleepy and it was a summer afternoon, and you suddenly wake up to realize that the PC for five minutes has been sitting there saying various things like this: "Is it a large . . . a . . . a large tiger, a . . . a . . . a very—no, no, a tiger, a stri . . . a striped . . . I can't quite get the word for this. A tiger with horns. No, that would not be right," and so forth.

And you wake up suddenly, the PC has been going on like this for about five minutes—be an awfully good thing to get in the mid ruds. In other words, the mid ruds are something with which you pick up goofs. And if you're really a smooth auditor you don't goof.

Now, how many items does it take per line to list a goal out? How many items? What an interesting question. It's almost philosophic in its impulse. It has a lot to do with how smoothly it was done, oddly enough. And the less smoothness it was done, the less in-sessionness it was done with, the more items you are going to have. So therefore you can't say how many items should appear on a list as just a fait accompli. How many items, bang! You see? You can't say that. But you sure can say that it isn't going to be ten or fifteen. Ten or fifteen hundred? Now we're getting more into the zone and order of magnitude.

But speaking, then, we're only speaking for the first goal. How many is it for a second goal? How many is it for a third goal? How many is it for a fourth goal? Well, these things become shorter and shorter, these lines do.

So, how many clears the goal? Well, as many as you write down well and expertly to a point where the needle goes free. That's how many it is. And it certainly is not going to be less than a thousand, I don't think. We've got the third goal, I think you're still within that order of magnitude. But I'm just guessing there.

The first goal, seven thousand items on each line I wouldn't worry too much about it unless the TA has gone up and stuck and has been stuck for a long time, or something like this, you see? I wouldn't worry about the number of items. I'll tell you what to worry about in a minute. But the number of items isn't something to worry about, you understand? Too few—God help us. That, no.

Now, of course you don't ever null these items, and the PC is going to ask you, "Why are we writing them down?" It would be an interesting question: Why are we writing the items down?

Well, my answer to that is writing them down is a better acknowledgment and it's a much better way to keep tabs on your lists, and there's various reasons for writing them down. But amongst them isn't nulling. We don't ever do anything with these items. I don't know anything to do with them.

Your PC at first will be rather puzzled as to which one it is. Well, of course, that's the joke. It isn't a Which one?"

He's been going a long piece of track on that goals problem mass, man. He's had an opportunity to collect an awful lot of identities. And the identities which he personally has picked up has had the opportunity to collect an awful lot of enemies. And he himself has collected an awful lot of things which oppose enemies. And he himself has had a very interesting taste for things which prevented him from doing his goal. He'll begin to wonder

after a while what possessed him. And all of these things combined make quantity. And the quantity is large.

All right. Now, let's talk about how long a line is listed. It is listed exactly to free needle. It is not listed one item beyond free needle. Hear me now: not one item beyond the free needle. Not even one! Needle was free.

Now, the proper conduct of an auditor, when observing a free needle on a line, should be professional. He should not suddenly get hold of one of his favorite valences of a rodeo performer, start bucking about in the chair and trying to put a quirt to the E-Meter.

"A free needle! Ha-ha! Hey-hey! Ha-ha! Ha—that's enough, it's a free needle. Hey, do you want to come around and see this?" That is not optimum auditor conduct. It's all right, because we can run the suppressions off.

But you'll feel like that when you first see one. You go to the next line and list it to free needle or, if it doesn't go to free needle, until the flow runs out as usual.

Sometimes one of them goes free, and three of them will stick for a while. Some of them then you've got two free, and the other two are sticking. And then sometimes you've got three free, and one is all hung up. And then eventually it goes free.

Well, the way to do that is you keep going one, two, three, four, see? This thing is stuck. This line is sticky; it's not free. Come back here to your next line in sequence, see, and put one, two, three, free needle, see?

Now your needle is free when you go to your next line; your next line doesn't upset it at all. Now, I can't lay down a rule absolutely here, because it may not make the least bit of difference. But if you said the line to the PC and you get no needle reaction of any kind whatsoever and nothing happens to the needle, it might be very foolish to list it. So we go to the next line and we read the thing off and there's no needle reaction of any kind to it, you see, and the needle is still free. And we come to the line we had that was sticky in the first place and it's still sticky, now we list that thing on down until we get to a comm lag, and it's still stuck. Well now, which line do we come back to next? Because nothing is cooling this thing down. Well, you'd better check them, hadn't you?

Now, it won't upset anybody if you put one item on each one of these lines. Now, we're into a completely questionable area of what is the right thing to do? Experience will tell what is the right thing to do. I can't give you a packaged answer, but I can tell you this: is don't list beyond a free needle! Because it's quite upsetting. It's something like asking for a rudiment answer when there isn't one, see?

And if I were to lay down an operating rule for myself on this, as something I would now be guided by, I would wade myself through this. I would read these other lines and see if I could get a stick, or a fall, see? Something.

And I'd get an item. And then I'd walk back to the line that was stuck, and I would list it till I got a comm lag. You get the idea? And I'd walk myself through this. And if I had three lines, all of which were giving a free needle, I wouldn't test all three in rotation every time. I'd test one after the other. In other words, I'd take the sticky line, I'd list on it to a comm lag, and then I'd choose another one of these lines—not the one in rotation; I'd skip a rotation, see?—and then I'd list some more sticky needle and then I'd choose the third one that was free and test it now. You know, I'd just walk my way through this, sort of like on eggs. You get the idea?

And I wouldn't list those lines. My instinct would be agin' it. If I couldn't get a fall or stick or any needle misbehavior on it, I don't think I would touch them. I'd ask the PC if he had any items on these lines, but my auditing command would not be "Who-or-what-would-want-to-catch-catfish?" "Can you think of anything right now that—anything, anybody, want to catch

catfish? No, you can't. All right. Thank you. Huh-huh, that is—that's fine. Thank you very much." Get off of there, see?

PC said, "Yeah, I just thought . . . uh game wardens catch catfish every now and then." And then you've set it down, see? All right. He just gave you that gratuitously; that's to keep from missing withholds.

You're at a touchy end of the case. And obviously to you it isn't a touchy end of the case at all, because the PC is now practically Clear and a Clear can stand anything. That might be your reason. If the needle is this free, why, doesn't matter how we treat the PC, does it?

Well, that's the wrong kind of thinking. Because right at that stage of the game it is rather edgy, because you could take one of these free-needle lines and you could list it right on into a hole. In other words, you could stick it all up again. It's already happened here, don't think I'm just dealing on theory only. Overlisting has occurred.

All right. That's enough for that. You can certainly list through to free needle on four lines.

Now, if one line consistently and continually hangs up, and you can't make it go free, then you investigate the living daylights out of what is wrong with that particular line and see if you can find anything wrong with it at all. And see if you can get any variation of wording of that line to fire nicely and neatly, and continue listing on that new wording, and that line will go clean. Okay? That's in case of emergency. Because there might have been, throughout, something wrong with that one line. See, you might have missed it. Already been done here, so it can happen. Three lines went free, one didn't.

Well, when that happened before, your was in the fourth line. That your was enough to keep that line from going free. And an examination of it—only took a couple, three sessions of listing after that, and all four lines were free, just like that, see? So, suspect that if you get too much an inequality of this, and it's hanging on too long, don't let it go for months; look into it. Okay?

All right. Now, what are the dangers of listing? Number one, listing is auditing. It is auditing and must be treated as such. It is the only therapeutic action undertaken to free a goal—is merely listing. The pi: does not give out these answers analytically, no matter how bright and alert the PC might act. They're all being dealt off the bottom of the deck, all out of the reactive mind, and you must not worry as to whether the PC is inventing answers or dreaming them up or thinking of them analytically or anything else. Just be calm about this. Look, there are enough things to worry about in auditing without inventing things.

No, just take what the PC gives you, man. Keep the session going and relax. See? All right.

Now, as you are starting in with the goal, you have a period of danger. And this period of danger begins at the moment of finding the goal and is over when you have proved beyond doubt that this goal, while being listed on all four lines, turns on pain on line one, sensation on line two, a little more sensation than pain on line three, and a little more pain than sensation on line four. And when you've proven that to your own complete satisfaction . . .

Well, look, you're looking at me as though I should detail this more, but figure it out for yourself, man. Figure it out for yourself. Lines one and three belong to the PC. And lines two and four belong to the enemy. And the enemy is sensation and the PC is pain. That's easy. And unless you get that optimum condition of affairs, that goal is wrong. And you better get off of that, hotter than hot and faster than fast.

Line one—here's what makes a goal wrong: Line one turns on sensation. "Who or what would want to catch catfish?"

Dizzy, misemotional, groggy, "Uh-u-uhhh-ohhh," see? Pressures.

“Who or what would oppose catching catfish?”

“Ouch! Oh, what a terrible pain went through my head. Oh, what an awful pain in my back. Oh, dear, dear, dear. Ohrrarr. Ohh, my—ouch!” See? It’s the wrong line! That should be turning on sensation; it’s turning on pain.

And we get to line three, which is the PC’s own line again, since it’s an allied line, and the person says, “Nyoom-m! Oh dear, still very dizzy and so on, so on and so on and so on and so on . . . Very dizzy, and there’s this little tiny pain in my ear, but that doesn’t amount to much. Sure makes you dizzy, doesn’t it?”

And he gets to line four, “Who or what would pull back your goal?”—you see, that’s the enemy, man—and, “Ouch! Urp! Pain went through the back there. What was that?”

Now look, that condition as a purity seldom exists. It won’t exist for very long. If you continue to list this it all becomes sen. Everything gets to be sen. But if you go too far on this, everything goes sen. The bank starts to become hard, beefy, lumpy. The person wakes up in the morning and the ridges he usually had are now really ridges. We’re getting an exaggeration of the situation. That bank is becoming heavy. It’s like running Creative Processing without having the goal “to create.”

And the PC will wake up in the morning, actually, and he’ll feel like there’s a board going through his head, see? Something like this. And he’s . . . And it all turns into sensation. It’s all dizzy, groggy, pressures, nausea, misemotion. Starts to feel like after a while he didn’t do anything to high blood pressure, probably, but he starts to feel like high blood pressure would be much more comfortable. You see, all four lines go to sen. That’s an interesting item, isn’t it?

Now, if all four lines went to pn, I wouldn’t worry. But if they all went to sen, to hell with it. Get out of there. You’re wrong. I don’t care what you think, you’re wrong! You got it? I don’t care what the PC says. That’s the wrong goal! Yeah, it read! Yeah, it’s fine. Yeah, it checked out. Yo. Yo, we had three instructors and the governor of Australia check it out! I don’t care about all those arguments! The line is wrong! because that is the final proof of a goal. You got it?

You haven’t got a goal until you have listed it two or three hundred items on each line, as the auditor. And that will save your bacon. Of course, if it checks out beautifully, PC got pain on it, bang, and so forth, you’re pretty sure, aren’t you? But the final test of any pudding is the listing. You go two, three hundred items deep on this thing; if it’s turning on pain in the right places and sen on the right places, and that sort of thing, oh boy, you’re in. Go for broke.

Now the only thing could happen wrong is you start listing with the rudiments out. Something crazy goes on in the PC’s life, he’s got PTPs like mad or rudiments are wildly out, or something of the sort, you see? And in a minor way—you see, checking the goal out every time is just a way of speeding this up. It won’t prevent clearing, and checking the lines out won’t prevent clearing by listing. They just blow it down.

But a wrong line will. A wrong line will prevent clearing. “Who or what would try awfully hard to oppose catching catfish?” And the next line to it is “Who or what would not want to catch catfish?” you see? And the next line down the line—all out of position, see, all misworded.

It would be too cruel an experiment—I have seen this in actual action—but you can take four lines, check them out, and then throw one. Now it will fire on a suggestion and an invalidation, see, and a mistake. You can get it to fire, of course, just like you can get a goal to fire. And now insist on listing that line. “Who or what would know he had to have to catch catfish?” And then put all the other ones down correctly.

The action of doing something like that is to bring the TA up to a stick. It's almost exactly 4.5 to 6.0. Almost always. I haven't ever seen a tone arm on a misworded line, or mislisting, or ARC-broke sessions, or overlisting in sessions—the errors you can make, in other words—that on goals listing didn't go up to 4.5 and 5.0. I'm quite prepared to see one go up to 6.0, or to 7.0, or 3.75. I'm quite prepared to, you understand. But it just happens that every one I've seen have gone from 4.5 to 5.0 and then stick. They'll stick at 4.5 or they'll stick at 5.0. And more have stuck at 5.0 than at 4.5.

So when your tone arm starts lingering around 5.0 for a session, and next session lingers around 5.0, don't be surprised if the third session your PC all of a sudden says, "Well, I was awfully dizzy. I was walking down the street, and I saw the buildings sort of reel." You're doing something weird. Something wild is going on here. Something's happened. You got to straighten it out.

Now, what straightens out? How do you straighten one of these things out? Well, you locate what's wrong. You better check out the goal and get it to fire again if you possibly can. Check out the lines, one after the other; see if there's any disagreement from the PC on these lines or these wordings. That's quite important. You're not going to change them around just because he disagrees with them, but you're going to sure make it's answerable, if you can. Check out your sessioning in general (which isn't really enough to keep it all hung up) and just straighten this thing out and get it to rolling again. That's what you're going to do.

Now, look: If you can't straighten the goal out after you've listed a couple of hundred, if it ceases to fire after two or three hundred items on each one of four lists, it's sort of "Which way did they go? What happened?" You got to get it back to firing again. Of course, if you can't get it back to firing again, it was probably the wrong goal in the first place.

The method we're using to find goals right now rather makes it very difficult to get a wrong goal. That makes it pretty difficult for you to get a wrong goal or run a wrong goal. That's the beauty of it, and why I love that method. Ease of auditing and positiveness of finding the goal were enough to have this. And that's not why I'm happy about it. It used to be that only an instructor or somebody who was specially trained in that little tiny technique of checkout—we could absolutely rely on the fact that it was the right goal.

Now, any of you guys, if you're good enough to do nulling by mid ruds down to a point where you find a goal, you're so used to checking them out that checking out a goal doesn't phase you anymore. You'll be able to actually look at a goal and say "Well, boom, let's check it out." Brrr, brrr. "To be a tiger"—tzal-tup-ub, bang, thud, bang. "Yeah, it doesn't fire." See, that'd be all there was to it, you know? "Let's see, is there a suppression on there? That goal been suppressed? That isn't a goal." See? Positiveness enters into the picture. And that's going to save an awful lot of bacons.

So, preventing the wrong goal from being found has been quite a campaign I've had to engage on here for quite a while, and actually what was marvelous is that this new nulling by mid ruds, not just for its value for the auditor, but to prevent wrong goals from being found, is worth its weight in planets, man, and it's pretty heavy.

Now, this idea of finding a goal, finding it firing, and saying that is the person's goal or agreeing that it as the person's goal—that's perfectly all right, because it can be run out. It's an assertion, see? That's all right. But when the PC keeps saying "No, it isn't my goal" and the auditor keeps saying "Yes, it is your goal," a ridge is built up which is pretty hard to take apart. And it will keep a goal firing. So don't argue over somebody's goal or you'll make it fire and fire and fire, and it's not his goal. You get the suppressions, invalidation's off it, he'll agree with it if it's his goal, and if it isn't his goal, he won't.

You could find an opposition goal. This is the other thing that could be wrong. You could find an opposition goal. Now, I don't know that by nulling by mid ruds you will find an opposition goal. I don't know too much about finding opposition goals, as distinct from finding goals. I

can't give you much data on this, actually, because I've never seen an opposition goal that would fire after it has been prepchecked and nulled by mid ruds. You understand? So there's always the possibility that opposition goals actually only fired because they were invalidation's of the goal or something. You get the idea? And they might not have had rocket reads on them at all, you see?

And somebody the other day came up with a reverse rocket read on a goal, and immediately proposed it was probably an opposition goal, which I thought was very interesting. So if you see that sort of thing, let me know. But I don't know that you can get a rocket read on an opposition goal. I don't know that it isn't just the invalidation of the goal that makes the opposition goal fire.

Well, you're fairly secure if you have found the goal and checked it out. But don't be too cocky until you've got two hundred on a line. And if you found a goal and then turned it over to somebody to list, remember to reach out, by the time they got three hundred on each line or something like that, and say to the PC, "How are you doing? How do you feel? All right. When they ask you so-and-so and so-and-so, where does the somatic come?"

And the person says, "Well, it's so and so on."

"Now, what kind of a somatic is it? Is it a sensation, or is it painful or what is it? And what line is it on?" And check it all out yourself, you got the idea? You know, don't read the auditor's report. That's a good prevention.

Otherwise than that, you realize that somebody who is trained to HCA level could be quite competent in listing. And listing is the longest part of clearing. So if you had somebody helping you in auditing and you kept your eye on the situation, a person with less training than is necessary to find goals could list goals, and because he was doing this sort of thing and doing some Prepchecking and so forth as he went along, he would actually get up to a point where he could locate goals. So it's a good training school, listing is. See?

Now, that lengthens the number of people you could clear by three or four times. See?

Now, you got to know all about listing and you should list somebody to Clear just to see how it looks and get the experience and that sort of thing, but I don't expect you to list every goal to Clear that you find. It'd be a much more economic situation for you to find the goal and then keep your eagle eye beagled on the somebody who is listing it out.

Now, how about auto-listing? Well, there is no telling. I won't say that auto-listing is impossible. I don't believe that it is possible or impossible, at this particular stage of the game. I believe that it would be better than nothing. Let me put it that way. But to tell somebody to go home and list on four lists and you will look into it in a couple of weeks, it seems to me like it's sort of taking his life in your hands! You know? I wouldn't be sure about this at all. But I would say this—I would say this: that if you were on a desert island and you knew your goal, and you knew exactly what the goal is and it'd been expertly checked out, and there was absolutely no way under the sun for you to get Clear any other way, I would say that you should pick up a pencil and a piece of palm bark. But we would know more about that in due course.

Now, these are the various ramifications to listing. Clearing itself consists of the cycle of finding a goal and then listing it until you have a free needle on each of four lines, finding another goal and listing it on each of four lines, Ending another goal and listing it on each of four lines. And the state of case is regulated by the number of goals the person has which have not been found and listed. Those are damping factors.

Now, here at Saint Hill it's fairly simple to make a first-goal Clear—not simple, but with heroic activities (let us put it that way), we can make a first-goal Clear.

Now, to find a second goal on a PC, and list that one out, this is getting much more difficult. We have just now found and checked out a second goal on Jean, and that was very, very good news, that I was very happy about. And at least it was stated to me in so many words that it was checked out today. Was it?

Female Voice: Hm-hm.

Yeah. All right, that's a second goal. Okay, now she's got a little time to list on this second goal. And I think they possibly even may list it out because the listing, very possibly, is much shorter than a first goal. But we know more about that in due course.

She's already starting to depart from the standard state of Clear, or such a person is already starting to depart from what we have considered Clear. They're starting to move up into Theta Clear or something like that, and it's an adventure from there on out, because these various states, now, of course are not regulated in any way by different processes to different conditions. It's a gradient scale of the same condition all the way, of course.

Now, I can't even tell you how many goals it is to OT. See? Or how long it'd take you to find and list each one of these goals. I was very happy to find today that the second goal would fire so nicely. Nice. I was told they had good rocket reads on the thing. See? I was very happy about that.

Somewhere up the line, why, the goals are not going to stay in. They're going to start blowing. But how far do you have to keep the goals not blowing to get OT? See?

But that is the road that we are on, basically. And it's a repetition of the same action.

The only improvement which I see in auditing which is coming immediately up, and so on, is a mechanical improvement. That is to say, a persistency of read—devices to make a read more persistent and therefore more observable by an auditor.

I don't see any changes to amount to anything on clearing as such. I do see some dodges one could do to probably shorten up finding a goal. And I see some frills one could add onto listing that would possibly shorten the thing up one way or the other. But I don't look for any fabulous advance from along that line. I don't. Because there are certain limitations that you hit, and the limitation is that the person has got just that much case, and they have to sit there just that long, and they can talk just that fast. Get the idea? All right.

And maybe when we're all OT, why, maybe we'll look back over the whole thing again, and we'll say it would have been much easier had we done it this way. And I hope that we're in that condition and don't have to do it some other way.

Those are the improvements I look for in clearing. I really don't look for many other improvements. But I do look for improvements that'll take little shortcuts—little faster, something that is more valuable to do this than to do that, you know, little things along the line.

And we may carve it down, we may carve it down considerably. We may use various systems Of auditing. Just given you one tonight: You find the goal, let am HPA list it, see, under your eye. Therefore you've lost two hundred hours Of auditing, just like that. Various other mechanisms of this character can be fine, and we can step it up into quantitative clearing. Our problem now is quantitative clearing.

My immediate problem is to get some of you to read an E-Meter better. Well, I'm solving that with drills and attention and various things, and I'm also double-solving it by making sure that a persistent-read E-Meter comes into existence in the very near future that can be hooked up to a Mark IV and red lights go on and pinball's dials go around when you hit a read, see, and it stays on until you do something about it or something like that.

But I have actually no quarrel—no real quarrel with your drills, no real quarrel with your auditing presence, no real quarrel with these things. I see just this metering that's being a problem. And we'll get that licked.

I have a problem of how many of you can I push on through to first-goal Clears in a space of time, when the fellow alongside of you can't read an E-Meter and neither can you. You know? Some of you are in that condition, and that's worrying me. I got these various problems, but I haven't got any technical problems now. I haven't got any. I'm not even worrying about what's in the guts of this meter. I just told them, well, what we need is an idiot meter. You have an on-and-off switch and a red light. When you say something to the PC the red light goes on. Or it doesn't go on. And if it goes on you clean it up, see, and if it doesn't go on, you don't clean it up. Idiot meter! These things we'll have. These things we'll have.

I can undoubtedly find where we can best expect the goal to appear on a list, and therefore cut down the number of goals we have to null in order to find the goal, you know? Do various other tricks of this character. But as far as technology is concerned, we got it made, and you're doing it. And the only thing some Of you are doing wrong is you're missing a few reads, see? Well, that's all I got to cure, so that's easy. That's that.

Thank you very much.