ROUTINE 3GA, PART II

A lecture given on
24 July 1962

Okay. This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 24 July AD 12. Another lecture, briefer one on Routine 3GA.

The way you detect whether or not a person is running well on Routine 3GA is as follows:

They've got tone arm action, and the tone arm is routinely and regularly coming down as well as going up. The pc looks good, and the pc is not very ARC breaky, and the Want line gives the pc an occasional somatic, by which I mean pain. Pc wants to know what pain is, take a pin and shove it in him, that's pain.

Sometimes a pc will tell you, "Yes, I have somatics." And by that they mean a sensation or a dull thump or a twitch, see? Now, we want pain, actual pain, pain on the Want line, occasional pain on the Want line, and nothing else on the Want line. No sen—no sensation— you know, wog—wog, dizziness and that sort of thing. And on the pull back from the goal, occasional pains. See, that's the old Not—want line.

And on the Oppose the Goal line, sen, winds of space, wog, bzmm—bzmm, twitches, thumps, see, but not pain. I would say so far as maybe occasionally, why, the pc get mixed up and name the wrong terminal, and they get a small pain on that line. But it would be wog— wog, mug—mug, and the who or what would pull back the opposition to the goal on that fourth line, or whatever the third—line three of listing is, also a bit of sen—sensation, dizziness, motion, that sort of thing—that occasionally turns on, or winds of space, momentarily, not to any great excessive degree.

Now, that's what happens when a pc is going right and the auditor can read the meter and it's the right goal and the lines are being listed okay and the mid ruds are being kept in, and so forth. That's what should happen.

If that isn't happening there are certain things going wrong, and I will tell you what those things are on the whole of Routine 3GA in a moment.

But let me tell you what happens if 3GA is going wrong. It doesn't matter whether it is in—at what stage of listing the goal these things happen or at what stage of nulling or something of the sort—that is nulling goals—you haven't found the goal yet, don't you see, so the only thing that can be wrong before you find the goal is actually bad sessioning and bad metering. That's all that can go wrong, see; that's the only thing that can go wrong on finding them. There is something wrong with session form—well, TR 2 is bad, TR 1 is horrible, auditor can't read the meter, this sort of thing. And I can give you a lot of other materials to make sure that that goes right. But if that is really going wrong, then it is just bad sessioning or bad metering. And pc isn't ARC breaky, nothing is really going haywire if your—if your sessioning is all right and your metering is all right, you know.

But let's take after the goal is found. Let's take after the goal is found and you start listing it. And now we're going to find several symptoms if it is the wrong goal. And these things are very, very important for you to know, because by George, no pc ever went Clear on the wrong goal, because you list the wrong goal and it's just more alter—is and more alter—is and more alter—is.

There are four things out which can make a goal read. It's the wrong goal, but it'll read—boy, will it read, beautifully every time. Something has been suggested on the goal, something has been suppressed, something has been invalidated or something has been a failure to reveal— something has not been revealed.

You in actual fact only have three of these which are capable of making a goal read that isn't the goal—only three of them—but the fourth is supplementary to it: Suppressed. Because the wrongness, you see, won't read. If you've suppressed an invalidation you don't get the invalidation to read, don't you see?

So you've got—that's right, you suppress an invalidation, you can suppress a failed to reveal, you can suppress a suggestion and you can't get the thing to read. So you get Suppress in first. First you get in Suppress and then you get in Suggested—if you want to know the actual apple pie order here—and then you get in Invalidated and then you get in Failed to Reveal.

Now, this is quite elementary because anybody can tell a Failed to Reveal. It's the dirty needle. It's the little, tiny, minute rock slam; that little agitated rock slam multiple read. You say the goal and you get a multiple read. You say the goal and you get a multiple read. You get—say the goal and it goes bzzt—bzzt—bzzt. Well, that's a Failed to Reveal. You can always identify a Failed to Reveal. A Failed to Reveal never reads any other way. It can be such a tiny bzzt that at first glance it might look like a tick, but even that is rare. Usually it's a—it's a bzzt usually about at sensitivity 16 that is about an eighth of an inch wide, or something like that. If you can imagine a rock slam an eighth of an inch wide, well that's that dirty needle, and that's something hasn't been revealed.

So that leaves only two things that will make a goal tick—tick, and one is a suggestion, which is evaluation, our old two first lines of the Auditor's Code, for God's sakes, way back then, and the other is an invalidation. The two "—tions" and that's the only thing oddly enough that can make a goal go tick—tick—tick, like a goal when it isn't the goal.

Now, any goal on the list, any goal on the list can be made to read like the goal by a knuckleheaded auditor—any goal on the list. We've got a goal "to catch catfish," and it is no more the pc's goal, see, than "climbing clouds" is, see. But the auditor looks very hard at this goal, and he says "to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish. Say you know, that reads every time. To climb clouds, to climb clouds, to climb clouds, that doesn't read," and so on down the list. Now, he comes back through, and so help me Pete, "to catch catfish," tick, "to catch catfish," tick, "to catch catfish," tick. It'll go right on through till the end of the session, too. It'll go right on through to the end of the goals list, too, huh—huh. Why? There was a hidden invalidation along with the evaluation. The auditor seemed to give the goal an isness. The auditor, in any way at any stage, even at the end, misreads his meter, or he's got an invalidated goal that's already invalidated, and looks up brightly, and looks like he's found the goal, and he says, "Well, that—that—that reads; that reads every time."

Now, just prior to that, as the auditor went over the final list, let us say—usually this is a condition happening on final lists because the goal has to be a little bit sticky to get into this shape—as the auditor went over it the pc might have said to himself, "To catch catfish, that's a silly damn goal, ho—ho."

On the next pass around on the nulling the auditor says—of course now, the thing will tick every time because the pc has invalidated it—"Now, let's really hang this thing up but good, let's just drive it in with spikes and make this thing look just like a goal."

The auditor says, "Well, hahhhhh, that reads every time. To catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch cat—."

The pc has already said, "That isn't my goal." The pc says, "Are you sure?"—see, invalidation number two, see?

The auditor says, "Oh yeah, yeah. It reads. To catch catfish, to catch catfish. It reads every time, ha—ha—ha—ha."

Pc says, "My God, that doesn't sound like my goal." Invalidation number three, evaluation, invalidation, evaluation, inval—. Get the idea? Bang, bang, bang, bang.

Wow, this thing will check out by any knuckleheaded checker, and you start listing it—here we go. The tone arm will start going up and stop moving. Maybe this is after ten or twelve hours of listing. Don't expect it to happen right away. Usually four and a half, five, something like that, sticks. Pc starts to look awfully bad, bla—bla—glaa—glaa, and so on and sort of caved in.

In session they are ARC breaky as hell when you're trying to list. Yap—yap—yap—yap—yap, chop—chop—chop—chop—chop, you just can't keep your rudiments in during listing. And the somatics are wrong. If you get any pain at all, which is highly unlikely—so unlikely that you say: An absence of pain equals wrong goal. No pain: wrong goal.

The pc gets sensation, dizziness and so forth, on the Want line. Who or what would want goal? And now the pc after a while, after ten or twelve hours, starts going wog—wog—wog—wog, gets sensation, winds of space. If there is any pain at all occurs, it will occur, perhaps, on the oppose—which is highly unlikely that any will occur—but oppose is more comfortable to run than want—Want line. The other two just compound the felony.

Oddly enough a pc very often, if it's anywhere close to his goal at all, will run it with great, apparent satisfaction; will go around and tell people this is his goal; will figure out his life by it, although there are some blank sections that don't quite add up. But he won't be unhappy with it. He won't be going around telling you it's a wrong goal. Matter of fact, may even get mad at you when you try to tell him it isn't his goal, because he's so anxious to have a goal, don't you see. Any goal is better than no goal. It gets him off the horror of search, search, search for the goal, don't you see? He's more likely to hold on to it than he is to give it up.

And those are the only symptoms: high TA that sticks, pc looks bad, pc ARC breaky and the somatics are wrong. They are reversed if they exist at all. They're all opposition somatics, actually. Opposition somatics are sensation, dizziness, winds of space, that sort of thing, and anything he lists gives him those.

Now, if you keep going in this direction you're adding more and more alter—is to the bank, and the bank gets heavier and heavier, and thicker and thicker, and the pc feels all bowed down and crushed.

Now, in actual listing of the right goal there is a certain amount of bank gets thicker, there is a certain amount of wog, there is a certain amount of these other things, so very often a pc will persist hoping that they will go by and they will run out. But they do not; they get worse and they get worse and they get worse and they get worse and they never get any better. And that is the difficulties of running a wrong goal.

Now, a wrong goal is found by bad sessioning and bad metering, and by not hitting the thing right or checking the goal out right at the end. It's pretty easy to find a right goal.

Now, I've told you what is the symptoms of bad 3GA are. Somebody doing 3GA wrong after the goal has been (quote) found (unquote), you get those manifestations that I have just given you. Those things occur in the pc.

And the remedies of 3GA are these: In listing on goals, the goal is unrevealed—it's unrevealed yet—so get list complete or find out why pc won't give it. That's a highly generalized statement. These are the things that you as—if you were a D of P or something like that and somebody said, "Well I just can't find the goal," and so forth, you know. That's number one that you would tell him, see. "Well, your list is incomplete so go on listing and get the goal," you see? That's that. That's what you'd tell him, just automatically.

There aren't any other reasons except this one: bad metering. We assume the fellow is running 3GA, don't you see. Let's not get picky as to whether or not when he reads the E—Meter he is holding his pinkie at exactly fifty—three degrees from the horizontal while he shifts the tone arm. You understand? That is not what's wrong. See, that's not what's wrong. It's the goal isn't on the list or the metering is bad. See that? It's elementary my dear Watson. That's the only two things that really go wrong, assuming that the guy sits in the chair and goes through Model Session and gets the goals listed and nulled. You are not even assuming that's good, and you are not going to find fault with it particularly. That's not what you are going to pick on.

You are D of Ping some auditor, and he just can't seem to get to first base, and he can't ever find the goal; then you are going to tell him two things. "Well, the goal isn't on the list so get it complete," or "Your metering stinks." It's one or the other, and of course bad metering would have missed the goal. Prepcheck would have revealed a wrong goal. You see? All that would have been—been remedied actually in the—in just the standard rundown of 3GA. So only these two things stand out as being things that could be wrong with trying to find somebody's goal, and those are the things that are wrong—goal hasn't been revealed or the metering is bad, one or the other. Could be both, you know, too.

And the next one is when the goal has been found and the pc is turning up with these upper symptoms, which I've just given you, and the goal has been found, then this is what you do: There are only three things that can be wrong. In listing from a goal, the only thing that can be wrong is the goal or the lines or the metering. Now, that's all that can be wrong.

And if you were D of Ping somebody and he was listing on lines, and the pc was starting to get a high tone arm and it was sticky and the pc looked bad, let's just say, "that's enough." Nothing else going on, the pc isn't particularly screaming, and—and the somatics—well, he's not getting anything. He really can't tell about the somatics. No, he isn't getting any sensation, or something like that, and yet you're listing, and this is what you'd pick on. Or if the pc was screaming ARC break session after session after session, he just couldn't hold any rudiments in at all, these three things are what you do: You recheck the goal and recheck the lines and remedy the bad metering, see?

And if the somatics didn't exist, there was no pain of any kind whatsoever, and there was plenty of sen, sen, sen, and the bank getting thicker and thicker, and bearing the pc down harder and harder, and more and more, and all that sort of thing, then it's these three lines that you would check, see? These three things, is recheck the goal, recheck the lines and remedy the bad metering. That's all you'd tell this auditor. Don't tell him anything else. Don't say, "Well, we've got to reform the lines, and I think the best thing that we can do in the reformation of the lines—I—I—think you're better—perhaps it's your TR 4, or maybe the pc has a missed withhold."

I'll tell you a missed withhold a pc had who was very ARC breaky in session. One of the lines was wrong, and no auditor would listen to him. It was a missed withhold. It was totally missed on and on and on, and the pc only required a few more hours of listing to go Clear after the line was corrected, which is quite interesting. See, missed withhold.

So we just don't go into those things. Don't go into the mechanics of anything. There's only three things wrong if 3GA starts wrong, and that's you recheck the goal and you recheck the lines and you check the metering. That's it.

Now, it's very fortunate for you that nothing else can be wrong with 3GA. That's all that can be wrong because we assume the fellow—the auditor can sit in the chair, we assume that he can go through his Model Session. We can assume that his TR 1 is understandable. See, we can under—we can assume all of these things because they vary in degree from auditor to auditor, and it isn't their varying in degree which causes the pc to have a high TA, to look bad, to be ARC breaky and have sensation instead of pain, see? It isn't those things doing it, so don't ever look for anything small.

Now, you think you're jumping off for something adventurous when you try to find out a pc's goal. That's nothing compared to jumping off for listing his lines, because you have now hit the silk, and it is in the lap of the gods whether the chute opens or not, see. It's just that. You've jumped off into nowhere. You're committed because if you are wrong, the next time you try to find the pc's goal it's going to be much more difficult than it was.

And supposing you found two wrong goals on the pc, one after the other, and listed both of them. Well, the thing you'd do would be to find—try to find the right goal again and you take a third one. And supposing that was the wrong goal, how harder—much harder do you think the goal will be found next time?

Well, I know whereof I speak because I've had five wrong goals found on me in the name of research. I could go on the mother plea, you know, "What I have suffered for you children," you know?

But actually I know what I am talking about here. Very much on the groove, both from watching you, subjective reality, experimentation on it. It has not been easy to pioneer this particular track into 3GA because the GPM is nothing to stand up and box with, man. And I would say this, "I have been standing up and boxing with it without any information about it at all, originally, and it's got teeth, man. The thing's got teeth." Boy, you never felt some of the somatics like can turn on when you do it completely wrong. Let's really be wrong with it. Man, that's a matter of waking up screaming.

I'm not trying to exaggerate this. 3GA is pretty good, but you mishandle the GPM, you mishandle auditing, you let auditors start auditing goals and finding goals on pcs that don't know—even know how to sit in a chair, you'll regret it. I can hear it now, two o'clock in the morning your Telephone will be ringing. "My God, what do I do?"

Well, the pc, after they've been wrong listed for a while, are not in a state of mind to have another goal found on them, because any auditing at this point starts to beef up the bank. Now, that the bank has started to beef up, anything goes on from there and beefs up the bank further. And they don't want to be audited, and that is another little manifestation that you can put down. A goal that has been wrong and it has been listed—that person will then pretty well routinely tell you they don't want any auditing. And the only hope in hell for them is some good auditing.

So you see, I'm not trying to make you scared of the GPM. I'm not, I'm not, because I go on the basis that if I could stand up and box with some critter, you can. And it won't kill you dead; you'll just wish you were, but you'll come out all right.

Now, how do you go about these various operations? Well, I'm not trying to give you a summary lecture of all of 3GA. You've already got the parts of 3GA. I want to give you a few little modifications and changes and some stuff that I've dug up here in the last few weeks on 3GA that will be of great value to you.

You must complete the list. I've already told you that it takes about 850 goals plus to get a complete goals list. A pc can do this on his own. And actually I'd keep—if I had a pc, I'd just keep kicking him in the head till he gave me a goals list 850 long. Why? Because it's unembarrassing for him to sit in the quiet of the evening with nobody around and write down these appalling goals, you see? In fact, you are more likely to get the goal on the list, see. He isn't embarrassed by your presence, or she isn't embarrassed by your presence, you know? They write down the goals that occur to them. So you want about 850 plus. That's absolute minimum, 850.

But what makes a minimum goals list? It is not for your benefit, because you've been having a hard time establishing this, an absence of TA action. Take that as a matter of course. It's actually an absence of needle action.

You want a goals list so complete that when you read a series of goals on that list to the pc, five or six goals, half of them will give you no twitch at all; another one will twitch maybe once in three reads; another one will possibly twitch once, and one will twitch twice to stay in. And that would be about it. It's about—actually six is an unhappy number—it's more like—more like ten. You want about one in, in ten.

Now, this violates a datum you've had for a long time, that if the needle stopped twitching on goals—you're going to get a twitch anyway someplace or another. I find, recently, on very careful experimentation, that you can list the goals list down so completely that goal after goal, read after read, three reads per goal, and you get no single twitch for three and four goals in a row. And about the time you decide the middle rudiments must be out, out, out, why, all of a sudden one ticks. You say, "Well that's nice." You get a tick, so you know the pc is still reading on the meter. But that's about all it would tell you.

On first nulling you get three in per page—per sheet. And on second nulling, why, you get almost a scrub. It goes down to about thirty goals. Now, that's how complete a list can be. These ticks that you get are specific ticks. If you get a little, tiny rock slam when you read a goal as an instant read—of course they're classic instant reads. None of this slightly early, or anything like that. Man, you really got to watch that with goals, you see? You could leave something in if you weren't sure. Don't go beating your brains out because it isn't important whether or not you leave it on the list the first time. But don't go to the point of leaving them all on the list the first time because the pc has a constant dirty needle. That'd be nonsense.

But you've got all of these goals, and they're falling off left and right, and they're nulling down, bangety—bangety—bangety—bangety—bang, an occasional tick is all you require to tell you that the pc is still reading on the meter. Goals lists can be complete enough to leave a completely limp goals list.

Now, if that goals list doesn't add up to a complete limpness, make absolutely sure that it isn't your rudiments that are giving you action. Rudiments might be wildly out, you see? Make sure your rudiments are in well.

When you're reading that list don't be alarmed if two or three times a page, particularly early in sessioning—if your meter reading is good this can happen to you—I mean even if your meter reading is good this can happen to you—that early on, on nulling of a goals list your pc goes bzzt all—every once in a while, and tick, tick, tick, tick, and slash, slash, and then constant dirty needle and oh dah and random, and don't be upset if the pc's needle goes to hell. You just get competent in straightening out pcs' needles. That's all.

Now, I've seen a pc's needle straightened out in many different ways. The easiest way to straighten them out is get a fast check on the middle ruds. That is the most predictable and easy way. Now, you can introduce a lot of corny rudiments and dream ups of one kind or another. You can introduce a lot of extraordinary activities here to clean this thing up, but fish and fumble, of just sitting back, is something that you are eventually sometimes driven to. You can't get it in with the middle ruds, and you don't know what the hell it is. You're just in a drift. Well, sit back and say, "Well I'm going to see what this is doing," and just do it by steering, fish and fumble. You see the needle go bzzzt and bzzzt, and over again. You say, "What did you think of then? Whatcha looking at? There. There. There."

"Oh, nothing, I—I just—just the pattern of the table here in front of me, that's all I keep looking at. It's just like my mother's boudoir table, you know!" Bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzzt, you know?

And you say, "Well, anybody miss a withhold about that?" or something like this, see?

"Oh yeah, I broke all of her perfume one day, ha—ha. I nearly forgot about that." And so on.

The needle is fine, goes. That's kind of an extraordinary solution, but I have been driven to it.

Pc's needle becomes utterly unreadable. It doesn't matter whether you are reading a goal to them or not reading a goal to them, it just keeps going bzzt—bzzt—bzzt—bzzt. You don't know whether it's falling on this or falling on that, and it's just gone dirty in the process of reading the goals no matter how limp the list was. Doesn't mean the list was charged. The pc gets kind of anxious, the pc goes out of session, and remember those goals are awful, doggone restimulative, and they kick in Prepcheck chains, and they do all kinds of weird things.

But don't go on struggling against reading goals with a pc's needle dirty enough to be washed by the Empire Laundry, see? Don't do that. Don't keep trying to read through a dirty needle. What the hell are you doing that for? The pc's out of session. You don't know what the goal is reading on. Even though the pc's rudiments are in, the pc is out of session as long as that needle is ticking on other things that you've got nothing to do with, because you are not talking to the pc. The pc isn't re—the pc isn't reacting to the things you want him to react to, so therefore the pc's out of session.

So you keep going, and you keep going, "Oh God, there's that dirty needle again. Let's see, 'To catch catfish,' all right, it's equivocal, ah, 'to catch . . .' That's it. It's still doing it, I'm not saying anything. 'In this session,'"—you are shortly going to see a change for goals processing in the middle rudiments, by the way—"is there anything you have suppressed, suggested, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of? That read, Careful of. What's that? What's that? "

"Oh, I'm just careful not to think. I've been sitting here concentrating, car—concentrating on not thinking."

And you say, "Good. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. All right. In this session is there anything you have been careful of?"

"Yeah, just not to think, ha—ha."

"Good. Thank you. I'll check that out. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? That's clean. Do you agree that's clean? Do you agree that's clean? All right, thank you very much. To catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish, see. To hit polar bears, to hit polar bears, to hit po—. Okay. If it's all right with you there, we'll . . . " Because the second you started to say "to hit polar bears," it started going all the way across.

After you've done this for fifteen or twenty minutes with a pc, then all of a sudden—you've cleaned it up two or three times—this starts happening: The auditor will say "To catch catfish," tick, tick, "to catch catfish," tick, "to catch catfish. Yeah, well, that's out."

Once in a while be bright enough to stay in two—way comm with your pc because very often the omission of two—way comm means the intermission and intervention of a tremendous amount of middle rudiments.

This is the way to handle something like that. This is the kind of answer you get. You say, "What's going on? What's happening?"

"Ha—ha, knew when you read that slow that my needle had gotten dirty, and I was worrying about what I might be stuck in now."

You say, "Thank you," and the needle clears right up. See, two—way comm is always marvelous. Two—way comm has this limitation: If you can't find out by asking once, you shut up and do something else. That is the rule back of two—way comm. You can always ask any question of the pc. It's not a metered question, don't you see, in the line of two—way comm.

Cut comments to a minimum. The more you comment the worse off the pc will get. Don't comment. That's an evaluation of sorts. But you can ask the pc any kind of a question you want to. You can ask, "How are you getting along?" You see a dirty needle start up, you can't read through it, "How are you getting along"

"Oh, I've been very nervous the last few minutes ever since you read that goal 'to hit lions.' I've had a feeling here like I haven't got any top to my body."

"All right," you say, "thank you." Dirty needle continues. Get in your middle ruds, see?

Don't go on and on and on, "Well, what about this lion? When did you first think about this lion? Have you always been troubled with lions?" No, you are not running a session having to do with running engrams connected with lions. And you go on and violate this rule of "It's all right to ask him anything once," you violate that rule—that's a good rule, you can ask a pc anything once—you violate that rule and you'll find yourself running engrams and whole track and God knows what and all messed up and then running an engram so that you can clean up his needle.

Oh man, it's just getting dirtier and dirtier, and stickier and stickier, and messier and messier, and of course the less auditing you do the less auditing he gets, the more anxious the pc gets, the dirtier the needle gets. You see how it defeats itself? Because you're doing an alter—is, you are jamming him up in the bank, you see? Just goes on the basic principles of what the GPM is. So the more you alter—is what your intention is here—your intention is to find the guy's goal—and the more you depart from that, why, the unhappier the pc gets.

Now, it's when the pc begins to realize that you can read a meter, you're not leaving him hanging, or her hanging in midair, you know. "Do you have a present time problem?" The pc is about to say, "Yes, as a matter of fact I was sued for a thousand dollars today, and as a matter of fact the court is going to hold me in contempt, and let…" He's about to say something like this, you see? The pc says, "Ahhh," and the auditor says, "Do you agree that's clean?" Pc goes into a little bit of a state of shock, see? He's been not—ised, see? TR—meter TR 4 is very poor at this point. You only have to make a few of those mistakes and the pc doesn't have any confidence in you anymore.

Now, you make him straightway. You make him, you know, calling it every time, calling it every time, right on the button, never miss a read, you know, bang—bang. Pc eventually forgets about the meter and his problems. He knows you'll take care and he'll sit back further and further and relax more and more and life is wonderful and he sure doesn't get in your road in a—in a Goals Assessment, see?

And after you've been assessing him for a day or two, and he's learned that you are to be trusted, and that sort of thing, the needle doesn't dirty up. But the more extraordinary solutions, the more meter goofs, why, the dirtier the pc's needle is going to get. That's for sure.

And after you've been doing goals on a pc for a couple of days, a couple of days, and you find out his needle is getting worse than it was, then that means that every time you put in the mid ruds you must have driven half of them out, see? That's it, that's it. You just miss, miss, miss, miss, miss. I mean, there isn't any argument with this. It isn't because your tone of voice is this or you're that. It's just bad metering. That's the end of it. Bad metering is what makes the needle go bzzt—bzzt.

All right. Enough of that berating. The point I'm trying to make here is you want to audit the right goal. That is desirable. That is productive of live thetans. That doesn't leave you in the embarrassing position of the pc all of a sudden can't use his legs and can't hear by reason of the auditing session. That doesn't leave you in the interesting position of having a pc with a siren going off hour after hour that you can't hear but he sure can.

There's no substitute for the right goal. It is thoroughly recommended.

Now, how do you find out if you've got a right goal? And I'll tell you exactly how to do a fast check on a right goal. This is an Instructor—type check, but you can pull this thing off in ten or fifteen minutes rather than make yourself look silly. There is no real reason to give a Prepcheck every five sessions, mathematically. There's no reason at all to do so. There is every reason to give a Prepcheck every time you're having trouble with the pc. That might be oftener than five sessions, and if you're that smooth it might go up to ten or twelve. You understand? Five sessions was given as an arbitrary figure, entirely and completely arbitrary, just to make sure that you did prepcheck the pc. But there's no real reason to do it oftener than is necessary, because it can amount to no auditing for the pc, and can give you a roughed—up needle because of the anxiety of the pc. And you come out the other side of the Prepcheck with a rougher needle than you start into it. See? All right.

Now, the way you do a fast check is based on the data I gave you earlier. A goal reads on itself, as itself, on it's own charge in the bank, or it doesn't read because of invalidations or evaluations. That is a true goal.

Or a goal reads because it has been invalidated, and after you have cleaned it up, it for a moment doesn't read, and then starts to read again on it's own. But the only thing that make a—can make a goal read wrong are Suppress, Suggest—Suppress because of course you don't get the—the needle action—Suppress, Suggest, Invalidate, Failed to Reveal, see? Those are the four things. There are no others. There isn't concentrate upon a shift of attention, you see, and there aren't a whole bunch of other buttons.

Of these, only two can introduce a goal—like read. Failed to Reveal introduces a minute rock slam which is quite recognizable. But Suggest—which is Evaluate—and Invalidate can, either of them, introduce a goal—like read which is indistinguishable in size, frequency and magnitude from a true goal. Indistinguishable.

You can take a wrong goal, evaluate for the pc on it and make it go tick, tick, tick. Which after that, if you did not, if you did not check it, if it wasn't checked out well, would look like the pc's goal, and thereafter would be as wrong as a Confederate seven—dollar bill. And that's how people get on to wrong goals.

So here's a fast check that tells you whether the goal is the goal or not. You read the goal to the pc, "Bark, bark, bark," you know, and you say, "That reads." Now, a read of a goal at sensitivity 16 is never more than about a half a division. It can be cleaned up to a point where it might register a little bit more half of a division, but you are really priming, you are really pouring the petrol and alcohol into the cylinders, you know. You're not adding to its power, but it is so clean that it—nothing can stay that clean, and five minutes later it'll slump. But that is the most it reads, and it always reads with a fall. It never reads with a rise.

Now, if announced, however, against a rising needle it will cause a stick, and against a very fast rising needle will cause a slow. But in actual essence its action is a fall, a tick. And that tick is—well, you just won't see one more than—more than one and one—quarter dial divisions here, meaning about, I don't know, three—eighths of an inch. That's big, see. And the one that you will normally see, when you first see it, is about a sixteenth of an inch fall, instant fall. You say the goal, and right on the last letter of the goal, the last letter in the whole line, it'll go tick—sixteenth of an inch. That can be as small as a thirty—secondth of an inch. It can be as small as a stick, depending on how much invalidation—evaluation is on it. And if there is tremendous invalidation and evaluation on it, it cannot read at all. In other words, the true goal can be squashed right out of existence and not read.

So a false goal can be made to read with an invalidation—evaluation, and a true goal can be made not to read. Oddly enough if you invalidate a false goal enough it will cease to read again in its turn, and a real goal invalidated enough will cease—will star—start reading in its

turn once more on the false reads for which you can make it go through the cycle. You can make a bad one go through the cycle of read, not read, read, not read, read, not read, just with repetitive evaluations and invalidations, don't you see? And you can—whether the goal is right or wrong it will go through those cycles.

Now, they—keep that in mind that those are the only four things that

have to be remedied to make sure that a goal does read properly. You can recognize the Failed to Reveal, but you're going to use it in the check anyhow. The Suppress does not give a tick, but can make the Evaluate or the Invalidate squash out of sight so that you can't find them. So you have to use a Suppress.

So, you compose a repetitive Prepcheck which simply contains these four things and the name of the goal.

Now, I'll go through this thing fairly rapidly for you just on demonstration. You say to the pc, "All right, I'm—I'm going to give this goal a fast check, and I want to read to—the goal to you a few times and then I'm going to carefully get in the four goals middle rudiments, and then I'm going to see if the goal reads, and then I'm going to give it a fast check and then read the goal again and then we'll know for sure what that is. What do you say to that?"

And the pc says, "No, I don't want that." And you go ahead and do it.

The pc very often says he doesn't want this. You have to persuade him, say, "Wouldn't it be much better to have your mind completely at rest?" The goal is at rest, you know. The goal is to be active, and the pc says, "No, under no circumstances do I want my mind at rest." You know.

So, you say to the pc, "To catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish. That read. Thank you very much. We are now going into the repetitive rudiments,"—sensitivity 16, you see, of course—and you say, "On the goal 'to catch catfish' has anything been suppressed?" That's run repetitive, you see. And same question, same question, same question. The pc finally says, "No." And you say, "All right. I will check that on the meter." And you look at the meter and you do, and you find another read and you look back at the pc and you give him the more repetitive. And you finally get all the suppress, suppress that you can possibly get off this goal, and then you go tearing in and that suppress is good and clean. That's polished up like Dutch cleanser, see? That's bright.

So we move over then into our next one which, of course, is Suggested, and we run Suggested. "On the goal 'to catch catfish' has anything been suggested?" over and over and over until the pc says, "No." And let's check it on the meter, and you find one. You look back at the pc and you ask him again, over and over and over, until he finally says, "No" again. You Check it on the meter, something like that. Anyway, this thing is eventually clean.

Similarly, you handle the word Invalidated. "Has anything been invalidated?" And you handle that till that is clean and polished. By the way, it is a very good policy at this time to be in a state of operating a meter where you miss no reads, ever, and you miss no cleans ever, see? That's optimum. In fact, it's the only way this check will work.

So you go through that; and then Failed to Reveal. And—see how that would be worded? "Is there anything you have failed to reveal?" is the best wording there. "On the goal 'to catch catfish' is there anything you have failed to reveal?" All right, let's get that all clean by repetitive, and so forth. All right. That's that. Don't bother with Careful of.

Now, let's go through this thing, and we say, "All right, I'm going to read the goal to you now, 'to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish'." And tell the pc what's happening, see. Tell him, "Well, that reads." It possibly will if it's the real goal. "To catch catfish," three times, see, bang, that's it. You say, "All right, that's reading. Thank you. Now, I'm going to

have to do a fast check of these same rudiments, and check the goal." And this is what condition you've got to get those first four repetitive questions in so that you get a no read, pshaaaw, right across them, you see?

All right, you do it just like this: "On the goal 'to catch catfish' has anything been suppressed, suggested, invalidated or nonrevealed?" Wrong wording. "To catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish," see? If it's not the goal, if there's no read anywhere on that line, that's it, man. But you get the trick here? Don't go puttering around picking geraniums. Don't give him any opportunity to invalidate or evaluate or breathe while you are saying that sentence. Just rip that thing right off brrrrrrrrr, see. Even omit the acknowledgment, who cares?

Ordinarily you would say, "Thank you. To catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish," see? Bang—bang—bang—bang, that's the goal. If none of those read, if none of those mid—type ruds read, and the goal read, the chances are a thousand to one that that's the goal. And if none of those read, and you, by repetitive check, had found answers, you know, your meter is active on the pc, and none of them read, and the goal didn't read, it isn't even a cousin to the right goal. And that's how you do a fast check on a goal. And you tell the pc, "Very much—thank you very much."

Actually that's about a—that's really in actual practice, that's about a fifteen, twenty, twenty—five minute fast verification of a goal. And that's the way a goal has to be verified. If a goal won't beform—perform this way, it's not the goal.

Now, you understand that if you've got a read on Invalidated, and ignore it, and read the goal, you are going to read the read for Invalidated, and it will be just exactly like the goal tick. If there's an Evaluate, there's a read on Suggest or Suggested, see, and there's a read on the goal, that's Suggested reading on the goal. And if the goal reads with a dirty needle, it's simply a—it's a missed withhold on the goal. The goal is—withheld it from somebody—has been withheld, that's all.

Now, that's the way the pendulum swings. And that's how you verify one of these things, and this is how you tell if it is the goal, and if it isn't the goal.

Actually, there's no arguments about this. I mean that is the way it is, you see? And you could do it that easily and that well. But remember you have to read your meter perfectly. You have to read your meter every time, and when you read off that last sentence, brrrrr, you have to read that without a lot of halts, or gulps.

If you read it something on this fashion, "On the goal 'to catch catfish,' is, ah, there—anything, ah, that, ah, you—no, I mean, ah, that you have suggested," why, it then reads, see. You say, "No—no, no—no. I mean suppressed, excuse me." See. Well, don't be so confounded upset if you've done your TR 1 that poorly, that to be surprised if you get reads on these things when you just cleaned them because the reads just happened. The pc invalidated your reading of it or something like that, that'll now read. So now you have to go into it and you have to clean up those rudiments, see.

Now, this is what happens if you read that across the line, you got a read on some. You clean it up on a fast—check basis, see. And you clean it all up on a fast—check basis until you've got all of them, and then you don't read the goal after this until you've got them all clean on a fast—check basis, see? Then when you've got them all clean on a fast—check basis you read that goal "to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish. Thank you." That's his goal. You see what happens there?

Now, on the actual goal, oddly enough, the read will disappear off of the goal, and appear over on the Invalidate and the Suggest. And when you take them off the Eva—Invalidate and Suggest, it will reappear on the goal.

And when you've got this thing over here—you've got a wrong goal reading with a read, you'll find Invalidate reads, or Suggest reads. And you take the reads off Invalidate and Suggest, clean that all up, see. What happened to the goal? Where did he go, Charley? Which way did they go? Where? Where?

That's dead easy to get a wrong goal. Don't be upset about that. You come tearing down the last summation sheet, and you've just gone across "to bully potatoes." And the pc says, "What the hell was that?" you know?

You go tearing down the line, and then you come back to it after you've nulled everything else, and you say, "Well, I've got two left in, 'to bully potatoes' and 'to soar gracefully.'" And, "To bully potatoes, to bully potatoes, to bully potatoes. That reads every time. To soar gracefully. To soar gracefully. Doesn't read, that doesn't read, now. Well, I guess we got it, ha—ha—ha, guess we got it, reads every time, 'to bully potatoes.'"

Brother, it's going to take an artist to pull that thing apart, see. Boy, that's in there because hidden is the invalidation of the pc, and what's apparent, you see, is the evaluation of the auditor. And those two things will lock against each other and you try to clean this up. First you'll get Invalidate read and then you'll get Evaluate read, and it may be lost clear back there during the assessment sometime, and pretty occluded and suppressed.

The pc said, "Well, I really want a goal at this time, and he said so, and he's a good auditor, and who am I to argue," you see, and suppressed it. And then casual inspection of this doesn't—doesn't locate it.

Then you find yourself listing a wrong goal. And then the tone arm rises and goes up to 4.5 or 5.0, and the needle gets very sticky, pc starts looking terribly bad, gets very ARC breaky in the sessions and the somatics are all wrong and backwards. And obviously your lines are right and your metering seems to be okay. What is it? Can't be a wrong goal because we get a read every time we say, "Has it been suggested?" Must be the right goal, you see.

"I keep asking him 'Has it been—would you suggest this as a goal,' you know, and I get a read every time, you know. And I keep telling him it's his goal, and he just—he finally has accepted it." And it does, it reads every time.

Now, the funny part of it is that a heavily invalidated goal will read better than a real one, because it doesn't blur out. It doesn't have nasty tricks. It doesn't fade and dull things like that. It just keeps on going bang—bang—bang every time, a thirty—second of an inch. Never varies, nothing does anything to it except the second you pull the invalidation—no goal.

All right, there's one more thing I could say about it, is that ä goal, routinely and normally, fades out when the rudiments go out, and comes back in when you get the rudiments in.

Now, when during listing a goal starts to disappear is very hard to say, but it probably isn't until the last three—quarters that it's totally gone and then the read is still detectable at the end of the lines. But an awful lot of listing has to be done before that goal goes so that you can't check it anymore. And it never starts reading early and latent and other screwball things. If the goal starts to read screwball, it isn't the goal.

The real goal, when the rudiments—the four I just gave you—are cleaner than a wolf's tooth, fires every time, fires every time except at a very fast rise, because the impulse of the fire, you see, merely gives it a tiny slow and you might not see that tiny slow. If you've got a fast rising needle you won't see this every time. But every time the needle can be influenced by the goal, and not a fast rise, you'll get that snap, snap, snap. It's just marvelous to watch one of the things fire.

If you want to know what a goal looks like, and if you want to get very, very critical and investigate it very thoroughly, get ahold of somebody and pick up the goals list, take a goal at random and say, "Which one do you favor on this sheet?"

And the fellow looks at it and finally says, "Well actually, to kiss blonds, you know."

"Well, that isn't actually your type of goal. I know by experience. Actually, here is a goal here 'to whistle at men.' Now, that's really—I think that's a better goal. Let's put you on the meter here for a moment, to whistle at men, to whistle at men, to—it reads every time—to whistle at men—reads, reads, reads, every time, you know—to whistle at men."

Then you can sit back and just by the hour say "To whistle at men, to whistle at men, to whistle at men." You will get exactly what a goal looks like. And until you suddenly turn around to the pc and say, "Has anything been suggested on this goal?"

And he'll say, "Yes, damn it, so and so, and so, and so."

"Anything been invalidated?"

"Yes, I said to myself every time, It cant be." You see, and yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, you get it all cleaned up, and so forth.

And you say, "To whistle at men, whistle at men, whistle at men." There's nothing. You can make any goal read.

If you want to know what a goal looks like reading every time just invalidate the hell out of somebody's offbeat goal, and you'll see a goal read. Interesting, isn't it.

All right, well, that's 3GA. You want to continue your list until the ticks you're getting are about the size—and if you do continue a list that long hit it at sensitivity 16 for the whole list. If you can get a list that long first crack out of the box, or if you've been adding to a list that's been well nulled, and that sort of thing, do all the rest of it at sensitivity 16 because you won't get any other reads if the list is that limp.

And I'd say a list done as I've been telling you, and so forth, listed completely should be thoroughly, completely and all of it done at sensitivity 16 now. I know of no other immediate changes.

Okay? Thank you.

Good night.