

## QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GOALS SEARCH

A lecture given on  
9 August 1961

Thank you.

I was late because I thought Mary Sue probably had something to say to you. Good excuse, isn't it?

This is . . . well, for a while she was talking to you, but then I guess I interrupted her too punctually, you see. And now that I'm late, she isn't talking to you. What a . . . what a ball!

This is the 9th, 9 Aug. 11. Okay. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And here we go. you know all there is to know. There isn't anything I can possibly tell you now.

What questions do you have?

Female voice: I have one.

Good. Was ist?

Female voice: It's about running Havingness. If the pc's needle is . . .

A question about running Havingness. Okay.

Female voice: Yes. The pc's needle is ohm . . . ohm, fairly loose so that it drops off the bottom of the . . .

Pc's needle very loose, dropping off the bottom of the needle . . . meter. Okay, go on.

Female voice: Yes. At the beginning of the session.

Beginning of session.

Female voice: And it doesn't drop so much at the end of the session . . . though it's still more than a third-of-a-dial drop.

Mm-hm.

Female voice: Would you say his havingness had gone . . . gotten worsened ?

Oh, yes. It is very loose at the beginning of session, toward the end of session it is not so loose and the question is: does this indicate that the pc's havingness has dropped? Yes.

It also indicates, of course, that the pc has run into some ridges or has gotten tangled up in the bank in some fashion or another. And of course, all ridges are can't-haves. All valences are can't-haves. All wild and confused postulates are can't-haves and anything that is hanging fire with the pc is a can't-have. So any time your pc gets stuck on the track, the first phenomenon you encounter is loss of havingness.

And the phenomenon of havingness is a registry . . . well, I guess it's the primary registry and a secondary, apparent registry is that the pc is stuck in a lot of ridges or he's stuck on the track or he is messed up in the middle of some problems or contusions or something at this sort. And it appears to be, of course, that the track, the ridge, the difficulty he is in would be the cause for the tightening of the needle and basically the cause for the tightening of the needle is the fact that he is losing havingness or this is a series of things of lost havingness.

You see, a pc grips things to his bosom in anxiety to have when his ideas about havingness drop. you see, that is the first manifestation.

Probably if you didn't have the slightest notion concerning the remotest possibility that under some stretch of the imagination you could have nothing. Now you untangle that, it just amounts to the fact that you would not take any steps to possess anything unless you had some inkling that there might be a none of it. Or it might be difficult for you to get it, you see. Now, this difficulty of getting it does bring about this phenomenon of personal possession, so what you really see happening is that the individual runs through a bunch of bank and track, all of which tells him he can't have. When he thinks of can't-have, he pulls it in on himself and you get a tightening of the needle.

Female voice: so any tightening, even if it was so loose that it dropped out the bottom, it's still very loose.

It's still very loose, but slightly less so . . . it's a drop of havingness. You can tighten the pc's needle. You could tighten it from a total looseness to almost a total stick with sensitivity 16 by phonying up a piece of news for him concerning loss.

This isn't a laboratory test . . . basically, you look at it humanitarily and it's a cruel thing to do, but if you suddenly convince him that he had just lost... "Did you hear about the National Provincial Bank suddenly going broke?" you see, or something of this sort, "And all of its depositors . . . and the government's refusing to make any of the deposits good." you know, something like this. And he had all his money in the National Provincial Bank. Just before and just afterwards, you'd see a sudden wham. You'd get a tightening of the needle.

So any news of loss would bring about a tightening of the needle and therefore, it could be stated that a bank is a substitute for the composite losses of the person. Not necessarily the reactive bank, I'm talking about all of his . . . the standard banks, you see, and any picture that he has and so forth.

For instance, why do you still have a picture of the Battle of Actium, if you do have. Well, you obviously haven't got the Battle of Actium. You've got a picture of the Battle of Actium. So, the losses of things are substituted for by mental masses and these mental masses, electronically, bring about a tightening of the needle. I'm overstressing this point now. It's pretty obvious what happens. But your question is very well put. Does that answer it?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Okay. What other question do we have?

Another female voice: I've got one.

Yup?

Female voice: Supposing you have run one goals list and it's all nulled out and you . . .

Supposing you've run one goals list and it's all nulled out. Okay.

Female voice: Yes and you've had sensitivity say at 2.0 and you're not getting very good reads. When you start a new goals list and you start the assessment by elimination, can you raise the sensitivity so as to get better reads?

Oh, and when you start a new goals list . . .

Female voice: Yes.

. . . and you want to get better reads on your second goals list and your sensitivity was 2 and you want to do a different job. No. No, leave that sensitivity right where it is for a third-of-a-dial drop or as near as you can get to a third-of-a-dial drop. you can't have a pc, you know, who doesn't get a third-of-a-dial drop at sensitivity 16. If you're going to do a Goals Assessment by elimination, you do not keep increasing the sensitivity no matter what list you are working on and so on. you just do it all on a third-of-

a-dial drop. Otherwise, you're knocking out far, far, far more than you need to knock out in doing a goals elimination. And it's going to take you fifteen times as long in order to do it.

In other words, you don't increase your sensitivity doing a goals elimination or a terminals elimination at any time, whether it's one list or two lists or for a goal or for a list of goals or anything else. Never increase it. Always a third-of-a-dial drop.

Female voice: Like that?

Yeah.

Second female voice: She's . . .

Well, all right.

Second female voice: She has a case that you can't hardly . . . couldn't hardly read the needle on them anyway, you know and it's normally at 1 sensitivity, but on assessment . . .

Well, do you get a third-of-a-dial drop?

Female voice: Get two-thirds. Get it off the bottom on 1, normally, but when you start assessing, there's practically no reads.

You're getting no reads. All right. You're not getting any goals.

Female voice: That's true.

That's easy. I'm not trying to dismiss the question. The question is quite well taken . . . that's a very intelligent question. But you say that you have a pc and you just get practically no read at all, even though he does get a big drop, you get no read on the goals and you want to increase the sensitivity in order to get reads on the goals. Nah. You're trying to make goals do that you haven't got.

Female voice: Yeah. Okay.

You haven't got this person's goals, that's all. Follow the same rationale. Okay?

Female voice: Right. Thanks.

All right. There's something else about goals there that I noticed going along. You say a first list and a second list. Actually, you know, I never get a first list and a second list. I work on a list that I add to and it's a sort of a revolving squirrel cage. you know, I just keep putting down . . . every time I get to the end of the list of goals, I shake them . . . keep shaking them down for more goals at the end of this list and the list just accumulates. And that doesn't even mean that I've gotten rid of all the goals on that first list, see. I actually got a listing of 163 goals and I started going down this goals list, and 60 of the goals are still alive and just by the fact that I reached the bottom of the list, I start asking for new goals, you see. I don't wait until I got them all gone before I find some more. I try to keep the list cumulative and it's quite interesting. It'd work faster that way. Now, I don't know whether you're doing it that way or not, but I'm just telling you right now. Okay?

Male voice: Ron, a question in theory here. What makes "the" goal, the final goal that you get, persist?

What makes "the" goal persist? The final goal that you get. What makes fit persist? I was wondering when somebody would get bright enough to ask that question. What makes that valence persist? See. Why? Well, the final goal persists because it's got an answer and the answer is the terminal. Well, the terminal is the answer to that goal and this betokens an enormous amount of success.

The appearance of a goal, when you finally get it, is actually the long-term problem of the case. And all problems have persistence and what you've done is reach in and pick the central problem of the person

out. This goal is a hope that he can do something about this problem. That is what a goal really is. It's a hope that he can do something about the problem and the problem, of course is inherent in the goal and this problem has persisted for the duration of track practically. That's a very long-term proposition ordinarily when you're doing your regular Goals Assessment . . . unless you've got present time problem comes out to be your Goals Assessment, you see. But it will just be on the chain and you've just picked it up late in some late form. So the persistence of a problem is due to the fact that nobody ever as-ises the confusion of the postulate-counter-postulate and the motion-counter-motion and these things are all pinned in place anyhow so it's . . . it's a big byaaaah.

All right. Now, this has a hope about it. This big problem, it has a hope and the person hopes to do something about this problem and therefore, he answers up as the hope. He can't confront the problem, but he can confront this hope about it, you see. The problem, if it . . . if the problem were totally confronted, wouldn't be there. So he's never been able to confront this problem and don't think you're going to get him to. you go on a via, so you get him to confront the hope.

All right. Now, the hope itself is pinned in place . . . and there's the goal . . . by the fact that a valence solves that goal, maybe. You know, it's sort of stated that way in his mind, you know.

The total solution to this goal and the beingness that will achieve this goal is absolutely, concretely and without any variation whatsoever, a ninefoot cat and there is no slightest doubt about this and that's the way it is. Except it, of course, might not.

So it's a total certainty with the invalidations of uncertainties hung on it, so that of course hangs up the terminal. So the terminal is hung up, the hope is hung up because the problem is hung up and the three are all there in a . . . in a bunch. Now when you get the hope, the hope rather tends to lose its charge when you get the proper valence that goes with that hope, see. So then you've got . . . now you're in the realm of terminal.

Now, all the time he's working on this and going up and down the line on this, you're actually cutting away and orienting him on the subject of this valence, this beingness, and eventually it starts dawning on him what this "beingness" is there to do. And what the beingness is supposed to do and what it can't do and the clarification of the beingness of course, it's sort of: you let the pc . . . now, I'm just talking theoretically . . . you let the pc look around at this great problem through the eyes of this beingness that solved it. So of course he's right in the middle of this problem, so he's busy confronting this problem all the time and he . . . if he confronts it enough on the Prehav Scale runs, he eventually winds up at the other end having confronted the problem . . . the problem disappears, the valence disappears.

The goal might or might not still be there. If the goal were still there, it'd be quite surprising, but it might be. On a proper assessment, it wouldn't be there. The valence wouldn't be there, the goal wouldn't be there and the problem wouldn't be there. See, that would be on a perfect assessment, perfect run. Quite interesting. All . . . all three of these things would blow up and you wouldn't get this particular persistence.

There's a sneaker on this, and that is the state of beingnesses: What are beingnesses? Now, you already have a thetan that is totally invalidated if he thinks he can't do it but has to have a pat beingness in order to do it. you get that little sneaker on the end? In other words, he's a gone dog. It's like machinery, you see.

Now, when a fellow's been overwhelmed by a machine, man, he has had it. When you see a pc sitting there who is nothing but machine, who thinks as a machine, who answers on a machine, who is a machine, that is about the most invalidation you could get. In other words, he isn't even alive. He isn't even alive enough to be overwhelmed by a beingness. He is only . . . you get how far this is?

That fellow will come up to a beingness and a machine overwhelmingness, though, is an example of this, you see. The individual has disappeared . . . and it . . . actually the machine is an overwhelmed valence and the machine has overwhelmed the valence he was in to such a degree that, well, it's . . . it's lost too. And you get this minus-zero thetan who hasn't a clue who, what, when or where, who's overwhelmed by a machine. But actually between that machine that overwhelmed and the thetan, there's a beingness that got overwhelmed and you quite ordinarily will be sorting out a valence or terminal and you'll find all of a sudden you will sort a machine. The machine will be showing up there and then the machine goes off and

you have a beingness and now you've got a terminal. That's quite amazing And sometimes by the way you get the machine as the terminal and then you run that and then you'll find out for the same goal, you very probably will have to find a new terminal after that machine's gone. Because there's a sandwich there, you see?

All right. Now, this next point, the point I'm trying to make here, is that in all acceptances of beingnesses, you have betokened failure. The person must have failed as himself to have a beingness to carry on for him. So this is, of course, your basic invalidation and that lies back of that.

Now getting rid of the valence and squaring around the valence and orienting that particular problem, which made the hope . . . called a goal . . . and the valence take place and stick. In orienting those things, you make a MEST Clear.

Now, let me call something to your attention. You've not done anything about uninvalidating the thetan. See? He's sort of looking out from underneath the covers, you know. All you've done is reorient this thetan on the subject of valences and he's got the clue on the subject of valences, but he's still got problems and he really isn't himself yet and when he becomes himself a hundred percent . . . now of course all beingnesses . . . he has no necessity for beingnesses. So the basic definition of Theta Clear is: No further necessity for beingnesses. Got that? All right.

Well, that's just . . . that's a very exact definition. No further necessity for beingnesses equals Theta Clear. But even though he has no necessity for beingnesses, he might not be able to do everything he would like to do and so you have a Theta Clear who can't necessarily tear up ladies' scarves in the thin air and you move from that point to OT. Do you get what this is? You get how that gap would be closed? It would be an able, a very able thetan. Well, all you have to do is have him know he's a thetan and be able to be a thetan and be able to exist without any assist . . . his beingnesses, and you, of course, have a Theta Clear.

So if a fellow can exist without synthetic beingnesses which are solutions to problems he can't confront, you've got a MEST Clear. See? He's still in a body, you see. That's why you call him a MEST Clear. He's got body beingness yet. But he's gotten rid of these synthetic valences. These synthetic valences aren't bothering him now, so that's out of the way.

But he's still pretty dependent on a body. He doesn't think he could walk down the street. He doesn't think anybody would say hello to him if he walked down the street without a body. He knows pretty well they wouldn't. He can get the horrified idea even if he's Clear just of this. So you can get the horrified idea of walking through the local town and being utterly ignored by one and all. He doesn't like this.

He keeps lugging a hundred and some pounds of meat around with him. And he keeps putting up this meat and saying, "Say hello to it," you know and this is his level of conviction. But all he needs then . . . the only thing he's depending on actually is MEST beingnesses. No longer any synthetic mental beingnesses. He had no dependence on those things at all. Well, that's a MEST Clear.

But remember he's still dependent on MEST and he's still dependent on a MEST beingness. Well, when you don't any longer have a dependence on a MEST beingness and identity you have a Theta Clear. That's a real honest-to-goodness Theta Clear. And every once in a while somebody writes and says, 'Well, we've cleared this fellow up. He was cleared some time ago, and now we've cleared him to MEST Clear,' you know. There's always a burning question that you can ask on the thing. Well, is he still lugging around a hundred and some pounds of meat? You know. Does he have to? And if he doesn't have to, why of course, he's Theta Clear.

And then if somebody wrote you and told you that he'd made an OT, however . . . he'd personally made OT, you know . . . why, the only test question you'd have to ask him is, "Well, how did you hold the pen?" If he writes you, 'With my hand, of course,' you say "Why?" you know. And of course, you don't send him the halo. It's a halo you have to issue for OT, you see. We've had some in stock. They're . . . they're surplus. We've had some surplus halos in stock for some little time. They were originally made for Christianity and then nobody could qualify.

Okay. What other questions do we have?

Female voice: What is actually wrong with a case that takes such a tremendous time in doing the Goals Assessment on them? What are they doing? Are they playing a game with the auditor? Are they in a games condition . . .

Nah!

Female voice: . . . on auditing or are they just . . .

Yeah, well, yeah. There's something in that. They're not playing a game with the auditor. They're in a games condition with the auditor.

Female voice: Uh-huh.

But maybe there's more to your question.

Female voice: No, I just wondered . . .

What is going on with the pc . . .

Female voice: Yeah. That it takes such a tremendous . . .

. . . who takes such tremendous long time in getting assessed and up to a Goals Assessment? What is this pc doing?

Female voice: Right.

Well, of course, if we could say specifically exactly what this pc was doing, he of course would be assessed much faster. So we probably at this moment don't have all of the answers for exactly what it takes so long and we're work . . we work instead on the auditor trying to get him to make a perfect approach to this situation. That is our best answer to it at this time and the most enduring answer.

But what is wrong with this pc? Now, you're asking me mostly for conjecture. I say it's conjecture, he could be doing an enormous list of things and amongst them, of course, you could include as a common denominator to all of them, he's in some kind of a games condition with regard to life. But he isn't kidding the auditor and I don't think people are playing coy and being mean and so forth. They aren't, really. They're doing all right.

They just can't bring themselves to give up much. The guy is actually being asked to give up his dreams. They're the most valuable commodity there is. There's been a poem written about them . . when the last of a man's dreams is dead, why, the man is dead, you know. And if you badly do a Goals Assessment, he sort of gets the sensation like he's being killed, dream by dream. And that is why I say we got rid of some of that when we took this third-of-a-dial drop, you know, as a Goals Assessment. You're not trying to rub the pc out as he sits in the chair after all. Let's just find out if this goal is consistent and continual.

Now, giving up something valuable to the auditor is what being assessed for a goal entails. And the common denominator of a games condition is "Thou must not have. Maybe me neither, but thou certainly." And you run into an obsessive games condition of this character. You could go over the hills and far away, and probably do something about this. you probably could approach it like this:

"Who used to ask you what you wanted to do in life?" And of course, the needle will fall off the pin on anybody who was having a hard time giving up a goal. Because it's certain that he has been plagued by his parents and associated personnel and maybe even by the military and other people. Some oblique, wild program of "You have to make up your mind what you are going to do in life" or "You are such a disappointment to us" or something like that.

I've noticed that girls very often . . I've had a lot of girls . . I've seen a lot of them from time to time who actually are just totally knocked in the head because they were . . their parents expected so much of them.

And they somehow or another didn't measure up to it and there was this terrific nostalgia about all this and this terrific, "Well, I tried," you know and now they feel totally degraded and very upset and they were supposed to paint twice as good as Leonardo da Vinci, you know, and sit in the model chair and look three times as good as Mona Lisa.

And simultaneously with this, they were supposed to marry a millionaire and there have been a few little mild goals laid out for them more or less of this character, don't you see. you know and they just weren't . . . I'll tell you a good example of this. The day of the Saxon is still with us, but the Saxon has . . . in America and England . . . has a peculiarity and the peculiarity is . . . is "Don't let him be." That's sort of a motto, you know.

And other races find this as very peculiar. You get down to Spain and you run into waiters. And it's all right to be a waiter. Nobody looks down on you if you're a waiter, you know. And you get out to China . . . Spain kind of draws the line from that point on down because a waiter is still able to dress and so forth. They start drawing the line on the laborer and they don't kind of want people to be a laborer, you know and it's just a little bit beneath it all. But out in China, my God, a man can be a laborer, a rickshaw coolie and next month be a warlord and it's just totally rolly coaster, you see. And everybody respects any beingness they run into, which is quite amazing!

You know. The fellow's a coolie, so it's all right. There's nobody chivying at him saying, "Now, when are you going to be the construction boss?" do you see? No, it's perfectly all right he's a coolie and he's supposed to carry a basket and every time he passes the tallyman, the tallyman pops another bamboo stick into the other box and this is the way life goes. And he carries this basket and they fill it up and he carries it back and he empties it and that's All right. And nobody finds any fault with it.

His wife isn't standing around saying, "Well now, Wong- ." And you don't have this vast notion of "getting promoted" or "getting on in life." In other words, they leave these beingnesses at rest.

Now, this could be at two positions on the Tone Scale. It could be a harmonic, you see, of a . . . of a decent attitude, and it could be a total apathy about beingness, you know. Well, the fellow was there and there's nothing you can do about it. That doesn't happen to be present in China. The other condition is more alive. It's quite amazing to watch this.

You . . . you're around a brick foundry or something like that and some bird all of a sudden lays down his brick paddle and comes over and offers you a cigarette and asks you for a match and sits down. And he's covered with dust and grime and he . . . all he's supposed to do is stand there with a paddle and pat the bricks as they go by or something, you see. And he is of no importance of any kind whatsoever in this area. He'll have a long, drawn out, very familiar conversation with you about the political issues of the day and about this and that . . . totally relaxed. He has no apology for his own beingness. He's doing a very good job of patting bricks.

And you run into some of this in the West Indies. I had a fellow one time whose name was Horatio Nelson and he let go of a barrel . . . he was rolling a barrel of rum, he was part of a longshore crew . . . and he just knocked off. He saw me standing there and he came over and had a conversation with me and he bought me a drink and I bought him a drink and then he went back to rolling his barrel of rum and there was no apology for it. It's quite amazing. No apology for beingness. It's very weird being in a society of that after being in a society where everybody is apologizing for their beingness, you know.

And you get in America right now young boys or . . . fellows in their late teens, twenties, something like that . . . why, they're always explaining to you how they're about to be promoted, you know. And in the services, it's enough to drive you mad. I mean every reserve that you ran into was explaining how he was really supposed to be commissioned an admiral, he left this job in Chicago which was paying him 865 dollars a week, and he'd given up all this to come into the service and he didn't amount to very much here now, but in spite of all this . . . you've heard that. What's the guy doing? He says, "Forgive me for being. The beingness isn't here. I mean I'm not . . . really not in any beingness, and I know it isn't adequate. And I feel like I should apologize for it all." you get the idea?

So you get this . . . I'm a little astray here on this other question . . . but you get this condition in American, English-type societies, at the present moment more dominantly. So that must mean that in this particular society, at this particular time, there's a tremendous amount of chivying at someone to make one amount to something else.

You see, there must be a lot of pressure on the subject which in itself serves as both an invalidation of the person as he is and a demand that he be something else, and that he have some (quote) "ambition" and that he have some goals. And you get somebody who has been clawed at on the subject of "You've got to have goals, you've got to have goals, you've got to have goals," and he finally just sits back sullenly and sets his heels and then eventually gets overwhelmed, so he starts giving you a bunch of goals that have nothing to do with his goals, but are . . . which are bought goals, you know. They're just foisted off on him.

Now, sorry to go astray on you about ethnology, but it happens to be a hobby of mine. And you get a condition here whereby the individual feels that if he voices any of his own goals or own opinions, he's going to get slapped down. Now, the various responses he could give, you see, was as he worsened in this condition, he could get to a point where he wouldn't give you any at all, you see. He'd give you no goals at all. you ask him for a goal, and he doesn't tell you anything. He doesn't even think of anything. You understand? He's just numb.

Now, this can go down . . . and as I was talking yesterday on the business of pretended knowingness . . . well, there's a pretended goalingness. And he'll sit there and pretend to have goals just to satisfy you, you see. It's kind of a delusory state, you know and he doesn't really know if they are his goals or not his goals or anything else. So this he could be giving off with, you see.

Well now there's another ramification that could exist in that and that is the individual isn't just giving you goals to satisfy you. He's giving you somebody else's goals for him in perfect confidence that they are his own goals.

In other words, you could apparently be dragging goals off of a person who in all honesty thought he was giving you his goals. And all he was doing was handing them out of a little goals package over here that was laid in by Mama a few trillennia ago, you see. And he just keeps giving you these things and keeps giving you these things and they aren't his goals. You got the idea?

Well, there are various conditions could exist here. Let's review these conditions again just for succinctness.

There could be the condition where the individual is just knocked in the head on the subject of goals. He feels he just better not give you any because it's just going to be invalidated anyway. Now, when you actually do then start to erase this fellow's goals, he feels this is true. you start erasing the goal that he just gave you, and he says, "You see, see, the auditor's making nothing of my goals." So this confirms it, so then he's much slower in giving you his next goal. All right. Let's . . . there's that case.

Now, there's the case that will just dream up goals to please you. It's just a delusory sort of a . . . of a package. And then there is the case different than that of the person who is giving you somebody else's goals in whose valence they are in which somehow or another fits on their own valence chain and naturally they would tend to marry or associate with people who were on their own valence chains. And they'll sit there and give you somebody else's goals by the package.

So knowing these various conditions about goals, you could speed up a Goals Assessment enormously. Let's find out what this person is doing and then let's straighten it out. Now, we're getting awfully . . . we're getting awfully adroit here to do this sort of thing. I wouldn't really frown at you if you weren't able to untangle somebody's difficulties in this particular direction, but you could hit at it and you could knife around on it. And you could take these three classes which I just gave you and you could ask questions such as his:

You could say, Well, if you did give me a goal, would I just invalidate you?" And if you got a very deep fall on this sort of thing, of course you've got an ARC break going on the subject of goals and you should

do something to clear that up. You're not trying to erase the goals. You're just trying to find out which one will hang fire. It's quite a little bit different, you see. So you could handle that.

Now, there would be the . . . another condition here. And this condition would be a simple condition of individuals trying to please you. And you could ask . . . this guy's very glib, you know. He says, "Well, what I want to be is a carpenter, I want to be a bricklayer, I want to be this, I want to be that and I once wanted to be a singer. And I want to do this. And I want to do that." And so on and so on and so on. And he just goes on and he gives you goals and it all seems to be automatic and he runs on and on and on and on and on. Well, after a while you suddenly wake up to the fact that he gives you these things and there's no charge on them. What is happening here? Well, if there's no charge hardly on the lists at all, we can assume then probably that the individual's just dreaming them up. Just . . . so on. So you can ask him a question something on this order and search this thing out real well. And some condition of this character, I think I'd ask the person, "What would happen if I asked you for a goal and you didn't give me one?"

You know, this would disturb the needle quite considerably if that were the condition the person was in, you see? "Well, I don't know," and so on, and he'd get into the idea of having to please you and so forth, and you could straighten this out with the pc, you see. Two-way comm sort of a thing.

And then the next thing that you could do about this sort of thing is somebody else's goals. Well, it's right here in this lifetime and you have already seen me . . . Well, the class at large hasn't seen this particular one. Well, we just had a couple of students here that . . . it was rather remarkable. We didn't get anyplace on this girl at all, until I asked for her husband's goals. And, boy, they just came out brrrrr and she even misread it at first, you know. she read it "goals for her husband," I think it was being run at and we got that shifted back to where it should have been which was "her husband's goals." That was what we wanted to know. And boy, she just ran like a canary bird on her husband's goals. I mean, marvelous. Didn't have any goals of her own, apparently. Had her husband's goals. Had some goals for her husband, but was giving her husband's goals as the response, don't you see.

Well, I'd be awfully tempted if I ran into that particular one myself to get awfully clever about the whole thing and say, "All right. This is a girl who runs on a man's goals. Obviously in her husband's valence. In her husband's valence that solidly, the terminal chain must be a man that looks remarkably Like the husband."

And I'd be likely to get a falling Terminal Assessment right at that moment. You know, just shortcut the whole thing and then check it back for the goal. Well, I'm not teaching you how to do this particularly. I'm just saying how I would . . . might go about shortening up some of these things. Very circuitous. I would find out that this person ran off brrrrrr on goals for husband and didn't run off brrrrt on goals for self. Didn't have any.

Then we must assume that the husband has stolen the wife's valence or the wife is you see, in some kind of a state of "in the husband's valence" or there's something going on here which is not routine nor ordinary. That is not very usual. Everybody gets in a little bit in somebody else's valences. they get mixed up in valences.

You get a southern girl in class here and Suzie starts to drawl. I mean it's . . . this kind of thing. That hasn't anything to do with it. I'm talking about this person actually doesn't have any goals of their own but just runs on mother person's goals. As though they were their own goals.

Now, I'd sort that out. I'd immediately suspect that that other person was on the terminal chain of the pc. And I would start finding out what this other person was in an effort to blow the person.

And I would do a Terminal Assessment "on that husband" or "on that wife" or something like this, see, or "on that father or mother." I'd just do a Terminal Assessment. I don't care how long it took me to do a Terminal Assessment. I would just go on and on and on and on and all of a sudden you would find that terminal would blow free. And then we would go back on a Goals Assessment again, we'd probably find out it would match up with one of those terminals. We very likely could get a terminal hanging fire though before we got the goal, don't you see . . . just an entrance on such a thing.

You have to find out what the pc's doing. That's the golden rule of auditing. What's the pc's mind doing? Now, those are a lot of particularities and a lot of mechanical approaches and so forth. And I'll give you a much better answer now. Of course, the person is not-knowing their goals like crazy. The person is not-knowing their goals, you see. you ask for a goals list and you get a bunch of not-knows. You say goal, pc thinks not-know.

Anybody who sat there and every time I asked them, "Do you have another goal?" and they said, "Well, now let me see, I don't know." I would certainly take it that they were running a not-know on goals if they did this consistently and continually and so forth. Then I would suspect that the person ought to have a lot of goals that shouldn't be known and the . . . there're all kinds of variations once you understand this principle. You could just have a picnic with it.

And on a Goals Assessment, if you understand the exact principle, how they're not-knowing the goals, you know. you ask them for various kinds of goals that would blow these things out. You're already doing it . . . secret goals, withheld goals and all that sort of thing. But there are lots of ways of doing this. you shouldn't shorten your scope of action. There are tremendous numbers of ways of doing this.

You could say, "Now, have you ever thought you would like to do anything which wouldn't be generally accepted socially?" you know? Not "Do you have a withheld goal?" but "Now, have you ever thought of doing anything that after you did it you would have to carefully cover up your tracks?" That's another way of asking for a withheld goal. "Now, is . . . do you . . . have you ever had any goal that other people sure as the dickens better not find out about?" "Have you ever had a goal to make people stupid?" "Have you ever had a goal to not know?" you know? "Have you ever had a goal to make other people not know?" "What varieties and versions of not-knowingness or forgettingness would you have me put down here on this goals list as your goals?" This can get pretty crude, you see?

"Now, let's see, what goals do you have with regard to stupidity?" Interesting question. "What goals do you have with regard to escaping knowledge of?" "Are there any subjects . . . are there any subjects which exist as academic Dr scholastic subjects which you would rather not have any understanding or knowledge of, of any kind whatsoever?" And you all of a sudden may hit the jackpot, don't you see?

The person says, "Well, hardly any. There's just algebra, geometry, physics, chemistry, reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, uh . . ." Then you might ask somebody, "Did you ever know anybody who had the motto of 'know thyself'?" "Who was that?" "Who didn't think you'd succeed very well in life?" Oh! "Who didn't? Who was that now? All right, now. What goal did that person have for you? Now, what goals did you have before that person started talking about it?" And all of a sudden you'll get a very fast . . . much faster moving goals list.

"When you were a child did you . . . in this lifetime, did you attend a specialized school of any kind which was fitting you or readying you for having fits in some profession?"

"Oh, well, yes, I went to military school from the time I was eight until the time I was nineteen."

"Well, how have you never mentioned this before?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, I've just been trying to forget the whole thing."

"Well, what is the goal of this particular school?"

"Well, I was supposed to become an officer."

"Ah . . . an officer of what?"

"Well, I just never got along very well . . . that has nothing to do with it. I never had any goals in that particular sphere, so we'll just skip that."

“Well, yeah, all right. We’ll just skip it. Now, getting back to this military school, what were they fitting you for, to do particularly? What subjects were you seeking to avoid in this particular institution of learning?”

And the person says, “Artillery. I just always flunk artillery. If I could . . . I had a goal in that school all right. And that was to get out of those artillery classes! Ha-ha-ha. Yeah. I did have a goal. Yep. That’s right. I had a goal. Yeah. Yeah. I had a goal to get out of all the artillery classes. That’s right.”

You say, “Well, that’s fine.”

The needle fell off the pin along about this time, you see. Well, it might be just a cognition surge so explore it further and further and you say, “Well, artillery. Have you been resisting becoming an Artillery Officer or something of the sort like that?”

“Oh, well, if you look at it that way. Yes, I suppose, could say so. Yes. Yes.”

“Well, did you ever have a goal to become one?”

“No. Never. Never. Never! I’ve never had a goal to become an Artillery Officer! No time have I ever had a goal to be . . . I wouldn’t even think of it! That’s it! There’s no reason to ask me anymore because I just tell you, that’s it. That is a closed book!” Now, you can go on with your Goals Assessment if you like, but uh . . .

What have you just hit there? You have run into a road barricade of magnitude on the subject of this person giving you any goals of any kind because somebody was trying to give them a goal and now they’re reacting totally on the subject of having been given a goal that they didn’t want. They are now resisting giving anybody any goals that they do want and you could get a crisscross going here on the subject of goals.

But you have to loosen up your mind in doing a Goals Assessment on the potentialities of a person being beaten down on the subject of goals or the person beating other people down on the subject of goals, you see? And once you’ve loosened up your own mind on how many ways could a pc be boobytrapped into giving a slow, numerous, covert, inarticulate or any other type of a Goals Assessment. Once you’ve loosened yourself up on this thing, you can outguess him.

Oh, he sits there, and he says, “Oh, yes, I have goals. Yes, I had a goal to be a pitcher. And I had a goal to be uh . . . once upon a time I wanted to be a cricket umpire for some particular reason or other and yes, I wanted a goal to drive trains. I had a goal to be a politician. Wanted to be a painter, bricklayer, cat. I remember I wanted to be a cat one time, and yeah, lots of goals. Oh, yes, I can give you lots of goals.” And, boy, they will too, you know.

You invalidate the pc, of course, by being too direct in questioning, but the temptation . . . “Well, now are any of these goals factual? Did you ever really want to be any of these things?”

“Now, if you hadn’t . . . if you hadn’t come up against it so heavily on this and that and being all these various things . . . well, just confidentially, what . . . what would you have been before they wanted you to be something else? What would you have been?” You see?

Ah, well, that’s a different story and all of a sudden this mad tirade of pleasing the auditor slows down to nothing, you see. And the goals that don’t fall, well, the pc just isn’t giving you goals in some fashion. You’re just not getting the pc’s goals. That’s all. Or every time you say “goal,” the pc goes into a ridge. He can’t have it. you can’t have it. He can’t have it and so forth. Because the needle phenomenon which Madge mentioned earlier would demonstrate the can’t-have of course at once. Needle tightens up and that’s it. You say goal and the person can’t let you have goals, they themselves can’t have goals. There’s various approaches here. I mean I could just go on by the hour giving you various approaches to shake all this stuff loose, so forth.

There's another oblique approach, is the horrors of ambition. I imagine that would be very, very useful today with modern youth, because apparently one of the things you mustn't have is ambition. They've gone to a negation. You find this very broadly but factual. A person doesn't want to amount to anything. A no-beingness situation. So you might have a dissertation, "Well, what trouble would an ambitious person get into? If you made anything in life and you made a lot of things in life, who'd take it away from you?"

Just go the various . . . round and round on all the conditions of games conditions and processes of this character. Who stopped this fellow's goals? Who blunted them? Whose goals did this fellow stop? And how did he blunt them? And can we walk into the middle of this and with a que- a few quick flips of the wrist disentangle the whole ruddy knot and just to get the thing rolling?

There's where lack of the use of the principles I've just been talking with, or a lack of a broad, imaginative approach to the subject is what slows these things down. For instance, an auditor who does a very fast Goals Assessment and an auditor who does a very slow one, there's a difference between these two auditors. It is not the difference of the pc. And one, the auditor who is getting a slow Goals Assessment will get slow on some people, fast on some people. In other words, he'll get the Goals Assessment at the exact rate that the pc he has at the moment is willing to have a Goals Assessment run, don't you see. He'll always get it at that rate.

And then you have the other auditor who beats the game, you see? Then he changes this rate by some adroit line of questioning. He smells something is wrong here and he goes in with a circuitous roundup and he decides he'd better fix this up. He asks the pc a dozen questions and he says, Well, what would you like to have been in life?" and "Do you have any ambitions or goals of any kind?" And the person says, "Well." Well, right there, you know. He'd say, "Well, what have we got to clean up here before we get a Goals Assessment?" You know, you hardly even ask any questions at all. you just see it written on the wall that this one is now going to run to some vast number of apathies. It's not going to be done by hours, it's going to be done by apathies.

And we say to this . . . another person, we say . . . well to such a person, why, then we might say, "Well now, who didn't measure up to your expectations in life?"

"Oh, well, my son, my daughter, my wife, my mother, my father, my grandfather, my teachers, the postman, uh..." And he could almost do a Goals Assessment on this basis alone.

"Well, what should your mother have been?"

"Oh, well, that's different, now." I mean it gets real live, you know. "Well, she should have a this and a that and the other thing, and so on and so on and so on and so on."

"What's your father been?"

"Well, he should have been a this or that or the other thing and so on bom, bom, bom, bom."

"And what should your son have been?"

"Well, I kept telling him just time after time, I mean day after day after day for just . . . well I just wore myself out. I told him the only thing he could possibly amount to in life would be a plumber and he just never seems to have realized it and so forth. And he just goes on with this silly artist business all the time out in Chelsea and so on. But he would have made a good plumber and I just kept telling him and telling him and telling him," and he's got real interest, see.

You watch it. you just . . . it's all in the way you handle the cookie, how fast it crumbles.

You get this individual saying, "Well, I was a this and I was a that and I was the other thing and I had a goal to do this and that and the other thing and so on and so on and so on. you want any more?"

"Yes, I . . ."

“All right. And I . . .”

I call that “pretended goalingness.”

Yeah, there’s a lot of . . . lot of different attitudes, but as long as you . . . If you’re trying to get a pc to do something or give you something or get something over the bumps, you’ve got to handle what’s sitting in front of you. No system under the sun will handle it wholly for you. you yourself have got to do some observation.

The first and foremost rule in any processing is if you can just parallel . . . find out and parallel what the mind is doing . . . it goes phlooft and you take it apart in any of its difficulties.

Like psychosomatic illness. You could probably set up shop. We’ve had several things you could set up a shop with. you could probably put a great big shingle hanging out flying in the wind on security checking psychosomatic ill parts of the body. Just that. And you get adroit at this and you get practiced at this one way or the other. And you just hang your shingle out and say, “Spines adjusted, skulls reformed, your beauty restored in twelve easy treatments.” You could make it cook, too, if you worked at it straight way. You’d just do nothing but security checking.

“What skull do you think should be hidden?” you know?

“What zorch are you trying to hide?”

“What have you done to livers?”

“What have you done to a liver that nobody should know about? Oh, that.”

Because in any . . . in any cluster of wrongness, you have a great deal of not-knowingness and therefore ignorant societies which uniformly specialize in wrongnesses up . . . in ignorance . . . wind up specializing in wrongnesses. I probably very often stand people’s hair on end talking about religion and [‘m . . . I can’t really say with sincerity I’m sorry for it. But I will say this. I will say this. That any zone which is a zone of pretence . . . it’s pretending to do fine thing and it’s actually dedicated to doing something entirely different and so forth . . . I’m afraid I’m liable to laugh at. Not necessarily attack it, but I’ve certainly reserved the right to laugh. Hope I never lose it.

All right. Well, one more question before we close this up. one more question. Yes?

Male voice: Is a Book One Clear a MEST Clear, Ron?

Yes, very definitely.

Male voice: Thank you. And also, are the South African Clears MEST Clears?

Yes.

Male voice: Thank you.

There’s only one person around in Los Angeles we’re talking about as a theta Clear at the present time whose status is in question with regard to this. It’s quite goofy, you know. A theta beingness is actually very, very dominant and quite visible by the time you’ve made a MEST Clear, so people are apt to get quite confused about all this. And they also think a meter should sit there and never say anything after a person is Clear at all but it should sit there totally idly.

There’s a point of clarification on this. If the person you’ve got on the meter is Clear, this condition will occur: That if the person isn’t doing anything actively and knowingly . . . isn’t doing anything, you’re not going to have my needle reaction. It’s going to sit there just square at Clear read and all is going to be well if the person isn’t doing anything. Got the idea?

But they know they're doing something or not doing something. Now, you ask this person to do something, you're going to get needle disturbance and you're apt to get tone arm disturbance too because they can change the mass of the body and they do it rather easily.

Evidently, on one report on a South African case, you got an inch-wide theta bop or thereabouts every time the pre-clear moved in and out . . . or the Clear moved in and out of her body. Every time she moved out of her body or back into her body again, you got a big, wide, inch-wide theta bop.

Well, naturally . . . naturally, because the electrical phenomena of the body was being considerably disturbed and you got the reading of the thetan moving out and the thetan moving in.

Well, that is quite different than a not-knowingness condition whereby a theta bop, you know, where does that come from? You know? A person says, 'Well, I'm not quite sure where I am. I'm back of my body or I'm in my body, one or the other,' and you're getting a theta bop. Well, that is not the reaction I'm talking about.

The reaction I'm talking about is you ask the person, "Well, are you in your body?"

And they say, "Yes. You want me to move out?"

And you get an inch-wide theta bop, see? And then it stops. And you say, "Okay. Well, move back in again." You get an inch-wide theta bop and then that stops. Got the idea?

In other words, it's . . . the difference of course, the key difference . . . is predictable behavior of the meter. Now, trying to clear up something on one of these people . . . because, of course, they're living in the MEST universe, you see? And a Clear walks out into an oddity here. He's perfectly cheerful. He's perfectly able to do things and he's able to get a show on the road and that sort of thing.

We've been so carefully sold on the idea of Buddhist serenity as a token of altitude and high state. A high state is a still state. And boy, that has been very far from the case in every single one of these Clears, you see?

They just depart wildly from this particular lineup because they go into motion and they . . . they go around doing things and tearing things, and they get impatient with things. And they go up and down the Tone Scale very volatily and they're quite alive and everybody gets the idea: Clear, Buddha. Well, you see, he's supposed to be sitting there and legs crossed, naked, loin cloth, regarding his navel, you see. That's what he's supposed to be doing. If he's really Clear, he's sitting up there doing that, you know. A bright shade of yellow.

And instead of that, you find this person tearing around, straightening up this and straightening up that and doing this and getting very impatient running into a barrier, you see, and saying whoooooa, barriers shouldn't be and thaaaaaaah and so on and then getting that done and fixed up, you see.

It doesn't present the same picture. It presents a picture of action. It presents a picture of effectiveness. Well, similarly, the E-Meter presents this same thing, but now the E-Meter is a problem when used anywhere in the vicinity of a Clear because as long as the Clear's sitting there doing nothing, you're going to get a perfectly idle, swinging arm, just you know, textbook and the person will be sitting on there, sets Clear read and everything will be just dandy. See this?

Now, they do something and you don't have that condition because they can very definitely disturb the masses of the body with the greatest of ease, don't you see and it goes flying off. But, of course, they know what they're doing and you know what they're doing too. There's no mystery on your part as to what they're doing. They're not sitting there influencing the needle with a thought, you know. They're moving around. They're kicking the body in the back of the head, you know. And thinking big thoughts and mocking up a ridge and throwing it away and doing things like this and this all influences the meter, of course.

So when one of these people has a present time problem . . . and they can have present problems . . . and you decide to audit this person on a present time problem, you are now going to have a picnic. Because one, you can't get the registry of the problem unless you're quicker than greased lightning.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" And as the needle coasts across the dial, you see. you have to notice this momentary little flick, you see, as it went by and you say "Well now, what problem is that?" And actually, you're trying to audit below the level of knowingness into the reactive area, you see and they're responding simultaneously on the analytical level.

They say, "Yes, I have a present time problem. Yes, I know about the present time problem."

And you say, Well, we'll try to isolate it a little better.

And they'll say, "Well, that's good. I'd like to inspect it and I'd like to confront it a little better."

And trying to isolate though what they're doing on the needle and get the needle to coordinate with the questions you're asking and the responses and what they're doing, of course is all haywire because the needle is . . . the E-Meter is totally rigged to respond on the reactive mind and doesn't register on the reactive mind. It just registers on electronic ridges and things of this character now which comprise, actually, what the body is built out of.

All right. What's the next thing then that we've got to have? Well, we've got to have a Clear meter, you see. We've got to have a meter that'll register this sort of thing and we've already had some despairing wails on this subject of people trying to audit Clears. Sounds funny, auditing a Clear, you see, but he's still got Theta Clear and still OT to go, you know.

And we're trying to get a clue what they're doing, you know and trying to read a registry and it just doesn't read anymore. The sensitivity is all gone. The needle is floating clear across, back and forth across the dial and you ask for a withhold. "Do you have a withhold?"

Do you think offhand, if the person were Clear . . . the girl were Clear sitting here at 2.0 and you said, "Do you have a withhold?" that the person would move the tone arm maybe a tiny, little bit, but then move the needle a little bit. Now, that's what you're accustomed to and that isn't what a Clear does at all. The technical facts I'm giving you now are of observed material. You say, "Do you have a withhold?"

The Clear says, "Yes. Five."

You say, "What is it?"

And they say, "Well, I had an unkind thought about you last night, and it was so-and-so" and there it goes. Bang! Which is quite goofy, man. It clears up instantly on the whole read. It goes right back to where it was.

It wasn't there to begin with, don't you see. And it's only there as long as they didn't tell you. And then the second they tell you, it drops right straight back to the Clear read. Quite interesting. They're very easy to security check. But the meter can still be used on security checking a Clear. But it of course blows up for any practical purpose on auditing, and therefore we have got this other project of research well underway. As a matter of fact, more or less got it licked. I think it's quite amusing myself.

Of course, you get these ideas about what a Clear should be and they're actually based on what you have been told a Clear should be. And that basing is back at five, four, three B.C. Gautama Siddhartha rewritten. And naturally, the way you would pin down a whole race would be to take them out of motion so that they made the ideal, a person who was in no motion of any kind whatsoever. That was the ideal. And now if somebody was going to feel good and be able and so on, you naturally would have to take him out of the category that absolutely mauled a complete race, see?

Psychologist today is cooperating in this. Don't think that this is a stray datum that only a person in the field of theosophy or something would know. It isn't. Psychology dramatizes this a hundred percent

today. They even wrote in civil defense . . . their additions for civil defense. The only condition under which they're going to incarcerate somebody during a civil defense disaster is if the person is in motion. If they find a person going around trying to organize things, they are supposed to put him at once in an institution. I read this carefully. I got their definitions for it. I couldn't believe it.

In other words, if anybody's going to do anything about the disaster that just occurred at all, why he's by definition . . . not by any stretch of the imagination, you know, I mean not me making too much out of a definition.

"Well, yeah, yeah. Well, who's supposed to do something then?" you say.

"Well, the civil defense workers, you see and the government workers are supposed to do something."

And you say, "Well, what if they were all in the wrong building?"

"Oh, well, that's a chance you'd have to take."

Well, man, you can take that chance, but after this ruddy country's blown off the face of the Earth by atomic bombs, I can tell you the first thing that will be apparent, is that it has no government. Now, what are you going to do? Well, you depend on the civil defense workers. Ah . . .

Of course, I'm not now talking about a field I don't know anything about. I'm talking about a field I know a great deal about. And the only people . . . the only time some order comes out of chaos is with . . . some guys get together and decide to put it right. And they'll be the guys on the ground, not the guys with the badges, you see? They've had nothing to do with that. And this is any time anything works or works out and so forth. It's because the people are there who are trying to do something. And you get all of these areas where just the guys with the badges can operate and only the guy with the badge can operate and under no circumstances can anybody else operate and you have the present Arab situation.

You know, these Arabs who were driven out of Palestine and you know they're there yet. you know? They're just a mob. And they just won't do anything and they won't lift their finger and they're just in complete apathy and there's never been any recovery of that particular group of people. And they've evidently followed out some kind of a basis that if any one of them got up and said, "All right, the rest of you guys, now let's go out here and carve up a few acres, and let's raise some khatinkas," or whatever they raise, "and cabbages."

They apparently said, "Well, that man is being too active, you know. He's trying to do something." So doingness has been divorced from being Clear. I want to make that very, very, very clear there. It's a booby trap, see. That's the basic and primary booby trap of Buddhism. That's the basic . . . that if you're in good shape, you'll be sitting still. Mmm-mmm. If you're in good shape, you can sit still.

I used to upset people no end by going out and sitting under a tree. And they'd say, "Where's the book? What are you going to do?"

And I'd say, "Nothing."

It'd drive them nuts, you know. Just sit there and do nothing for an hour or two. They'd go bezeeeh. How could you possibly do that? Well, a person wouldn't be able to do that.

At the same time, I'd get the same objections from a person, "You know, I think you're working too hard. you know. Don't you think you ought to take a rest? You know, you really ought to take a rest. I think you're working much too hard." Although you couldn't confront somebody being totally motionless, they at the same time couldn't confront somebody in motion. So they just couldn't confront.

But that's the basic tenet and one that we must be very careful of in Scientology that we don't give this thing much credence because apparently every Clear we have made to date has all of a sudden gotten busy and that is without exception. They've gotten busy. And they don't believe in being MEST.

They're very alive. And they get in people's hair. People get upset about them, you know? And they sometimes have opinions that are not true but they have them just because they believe them. And they argue and they're not necessarily totally a hundred percent right every five minutes, you know? They make mistakes, you know? But boy they sure make them on a grand scale. One has to give them 100 for trying. But they're in motion and they do get things done. And a Homo sap alongside of a Clear looks like a snail crawling along the road, you know. That's the way he looks to a Clear too, apparently. From their viewpoint, you know?

They say, "Why don't you people get moving?" You know. "What's the matter with you people?"

And "Moving? Well, we're just hurrying as fast as we can." you see?

They don't believe it. Speed ratio has changed on them. Idea of what fast motion is has changed on them. Idea of what work is changed on them. Idea of what is worth doing has changed. You see, all these things have shifted and I'd make this very thorough, solid recommendation. That we take a look at the people who have been cleared and then we watch what they're doing to find out what a Clear does. That's . . . that's snidely put. I mean it's a very sound thing. Because it's out of the area of theory, you see. It's long been out of that area. But it's out of this area of theory. It's a fact. All right.

Now, there is something to be observed about it. And there are people who are Clear and if you put them on a meter as an auditor, you would see at once there was something drastically wrong with this person. They weren't reading on a meter. The arm was coasting around and you were trying to run processes on them and you weren't getting anyplace processing them and you couldn't get any meter reactions and they blew things by inspection and all kinds of things like this and that's the way they behave as a pc, which is about . . . be the most reliable test of a Clear.

Now watch what those people are doing. Watch how they react and take that as your index, rather than Book One. Just take that as your index. This is what a Clear does. Well, this is what a Clear is doing. What is a Clear doing? And of course, there are an awful lot of people totally sold on Buddhism that will suddenly decide having observed that, that this is not a desirable state. Because the person now doesn't go and sit on the temple steps, you know?

There's this fellow down in the marts and businesses of life, you see. And saying, "Come on, get this show on the road, get that done. Let's do this." And "Let's go here. And I think it ought to look very nice and I've got some long term goals for this country . . ." and so on. "And I think we ought to be getting at it in this particular line."

And then instead of sitting back at it like the usual fellow with the ideas is concerned, the person gets in and works three times as hard, you see, as anybody else involved in the project.

A Clear in Johannesburg wore out the whole staff. Everybody was utterly panting and their tongues out. This person was teaching about nine hours a day and auditing a pc or two and answering all of the organization's backlog of letters in her spare time.

And things work out right for these people, you see. Because they've got more velocity on the thing and their postulates stick harder and they have a very clear idea of where they're going. They have no held down fives telling them they ought to be doing something else.

But there is our best zone of information and at the present instant, we really aren't using it. I try to publish little scraps and stuff that come along, but I ought to get it more thoroughly done. Of course, I also have the idea I shouldn't invade their privacy or invalidate their states.

Okay? Well, that's enough. That's enough for now. That's enough. You've had it.

Okay. Good night.