ROUTINE 3GA DATA ON GOALS, PART II

A lecture given on
7 August 1962

Thank you.

Well this is lecture two, 7 Aug., AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and we're going on with goals, Routine 3GA, how you do it. Let's start more cohesively and coherently and more abundantly at the beginning of the concisity.

You get the pc to do a goals list.

Now, I told you there was another remedy for a lost goal. You know, you found the wrong goal and everything has gone to hell. To make the pc feel better, just get him to list some goals. Now you can keep that as a stable datum. The pc feels bad because of any 3GA, get him to list some goals, see.

Now, that's a stable datum. No matter what else you do, also get him to list some goals. In other words if you clean up the wrong goal that was found, get the pc to list some goals. How many? Well, until he looks better. Well, in session? Not necessarily.

Now, you'll find out that you'll be tossing this off as an auditor back in your own bailiwick or organization quite often and you will learn rather rapidly that this is a way of pulling somebody out of the soup while you are sitting there with a Telephone in each hand, you see and a preclear on the couch and one in the chair, see. And at that moment a fourth party walks in the door, you see and says, "Oh, Fm in terrible trouble. Last night my wife threw me out and everything is going to hell in a balloon and when can you give me some auditing?" You see?

And you say, "Well…" The best thing to say, "Well, just as soon as you've got another 250 goals listed." And they say, "Oh, I couldn't think of that." Well you just say, "Do it. Do it. Do it." You know, "Do it." You know, "Two hundred and fifty goals. Do it, do it." You know, "Get them listed, get them listed. Thank you. Thank you. Don't talk to me again until you have them listed," and so forth. And they'll come back, they'll feel fine.

It's the darnedest therapeutic measure you ever, you ever had to—that. And you'll find out that that is dead right. You'll use this. You might not think now that you would, but you will. You'll find yourself using this. The guy's caving in. You know what you've got to pick up. You've got to pick up his missed withholds. You know this and you know that. And you've got to get a ten—hour Prepcheck going on his past auditing. And you've got this and you've got that and you've got these other things. But you haven't got time to do it. So just tell him to list some goals. Got it?

It's a panacea. If somebody is dying or something like that, it might not work. They might not be able to write or something like that. But short of that—short of that, it'll handle almost anything.

Now let's expand this just a little bit further.

Listing of goals doesn't depend so much on how many goals as upon how much charge is remaining on the needle. It's not charge on the tone arm. Let's forget everything said in Routine 3 on the subject of moving tone arms. It's moving needle. How much is that needle moving?

The devil with the tone arm because you can make mistakes, the auditor, the environment, other things and when you really start running the mid ruds on every goal, you're going to get

tone arm motion which wasn't there when you simply read the goals off. So that test becomes invalidated the moment you move in with nulling by mid ruds. Because nulling by mid ruds is, basically, running rudiments and rudiments is moving the tone arm and it's not the goals moving the tone arm, but how can you tell the difference? You're doing them both at the same time.

Well, so therefore moving tone arm is no longer a test for whether a goals list is complete. But a moving needle is.

Now you're going to want to know when is a goals list complete. And you say to the pc six goals in a row and each one fires a quarter of a dial. That is an incomplete list. You needn't do any more than that. See? Just, "To catch catfish, to run down waterbuck, to shoot game wardens, to have a high hat in court, to be a student and never to have anything to do with Instructors." And just read them off, one right after the other and you'll find out how much do they kick? How much does each one kick? And if they kick more, on an average, than a division—that's one of those little black line to black line, see. It's about—I don't know what that division is. I should measure it some time on a ruler. It's probably three—eighths of an inch, something like that. I don't know what it is. And if they're kicking more than that your goals list is not complete. Any kick that you get on them, if it's more than that, your goals list is not complete.

Now there's something more. If one kicks out of five or something wild like that—you understand this is just a guesstimate, approximation, because it will vary so much, various parts of the list—if one kicks out of the five, why that's enough and that one kick was just that. That's not cleaned up or anything, you see. That's just one three—eighths of an inch kick. That goals list is very nice or the pc is mad as hell at you and the E—Meter is totally inoperative. I think you could tell the latter.

If the pc's even vaguely in—session, why that read—you read six goals to him and one, two, something like that, kick, just that much, you say, "Voilà."

Now it's "or less" it's not "or more," it is "or less." As long as that needle is kicking a third of a dial, quarter of a dial and is kicking on four or five goals out of six, that list is not complete.

Furthermore, the goal probably isn't on it. Ah—ha—ha. And that would be very important to you. I can see you now, going on and on and on and on and on, nulling down 1500 goals very laboriously and then find out the goal wasn't on it. Well, there's a way to tell whether or not the goal was on it and that's how much charge is on the list. All right.

Now, rock slams don't count.

The rock slam has been the subject of considerable study by me lately. And I learnt a great deal about rock slams and they're all "failed to reveals," but actually "failed to reveal" is insufficiently powerful as an auditing command to pull off one of these big, heavy rock slams. It'll take off one of these little—these little quarter—of—an—inch—wide rock slams that you get, what you call a dirty needle, but when it's slamming half a dial, it's overts and it only comes off with overts. And it's usually overts on the auditor.

When you get a pc sitting down there and this thing—about every third goal you get a quarter—of—a—dial rock slam, half—a—dial rock slam, something like that, watch it, bud, watch it, because that's overts on the auditor and it's O/W on the auditor that you'll probably find is the most efficacious.

If not on the auditor, then on whom? Well, you better find any goal that rock slams, add them all up and find out on what it is. You can make little hunt and punch tests. You can eventually turn on the dirty needle and the rock slam.

But of course "failed to reveal" makes the thing go. That's quite valid. In mid ruds, just "failed to reveal." This other is an O/W situation. This is readying up the needle and that sort of thing. But if you're reading off a goals list and you're getting this nice little tick and it's going tick and tick and everything is fine. You get one ticking out of ten or something like that—that's dandy. Everything is fine and all of a sudden a half—a—dial—wide rock slam turns on. Had nothing to do with the goals list. Nothing to do with the goals list. It has to do with overts. And of course that will compare to the goals list some place or another, but you couldn't care what it compares to. It is overts. Of course, the goals list charges up the overt but that's beside the point. And if you don't expect to go the whole session spending 50 percent of your time cleaning up a dirty needle, cleaning up a dirty needle, cleaning up a dirty needle, you had better find out what the hell all these overts are on.

Normally it's you. You see?

You clean them up as overts. You understand that a withhold is in place because it is the—you know, makes the problem with the prior Confusion. You see? The overt is the prior Confusion and it's the overt which makes this hang up. Now, when you're getting a rock slam, why it won't come off by pulling the withholds, you understand. There's too much charge on the prior confusion, you see.

So you just keep pulling the roof off of the Niagara Falls, you see. You keep going out there with a dipper, you know, as it goes over the falls and you get some water, a little dipper full of water and you pull it over on the side and you say, "Well, I'll get this river bailed out eventually. One dipper at a time." See.

No, no. You've got to ask for Niagara Falls before it disappears and then it as—ises nicely. In other words if you can't get rid of a dirty needle on some pc, you'd better right straight back into the prior Confusion proposition. In other words, it's just overts and no more nonsense about prior Confusion.

The reason why you get a dirty needle, little shivery needle like that, it's a "failed to reveal," you see. One little tiny thing, it's about, oh, an eighth—of an—inch wide, quarter—of—an—inch wide, something like that. Yes, it—that's all it is. That's just a "failed to reveal." But if you went shopping you would find an overt you see.

There's no reason to go finding overts, however, little buggy stuff like that. It turns on once in a while and turns off again. But, when one is coming on persistently it'll very often be accompanied by a half—a—dial—wide rock slam, which is completely unexplainable. And that half—a—dial—wide rock slam is simply overts in magnitude and it doesn't pull by pulling withholds. You have to get the overt.

A withhold stays in place because it has a prior Confusion called the overt, you see? A fellow walks up, shoots the cop and after that he won't talk to people about police.

Well, you can pull all the times when he wouldn't talk to people about police and just find more times when he wouldn't talk to people about police. You get the idea? You eventually have to shop around and find out what's causing this constant and continual hang—up.

Well, you finally get it out of him, he shot a cop. And after that you haven't any trouble with the withhold. You see?

A withhold is always the manifestation which comes after an overt. Any withhold comes after an overt.

So, for that purpose, somebody suggested the other day we ought to call it the overt slam, and it would make more sense to one and all.

But that doesn't count as to whether the goals list is charged or not. That doesn't have anything to do with it. That is simply overts the pc's got which are expressing themselves.

In other words you could have a complete goals list which every once in a while turned into a dial—wide rock slam. It hasn't anything to do with the goals list. It merely has to do with overts. You follow that?

That's very important to you, because otherwise you see, you could get all messed up. You'd say, "Look how charged this list is! Look, I read six goals and I get three down the line and it's just fine and then here is this enormous rock slam that turns on and so forth, and so therefore we'll have to go on listing goals." No, no. Therefore we'll have to go shopping and find out who he's got overts on. You get the difference?

The person by the way would be very, very hard to do a goals assessment on who had that situation. Very hard to do. You'd have to be very slippery. And so you'd better—you'd better do a little more Prepchecking and get those overts off Find out where they are and they usually are on the auditor. After all, it's when the auditor's auditing them that they turn on, isn't it? Well, it proves itself, doesn't it?

When he's not on an E—Meter he doesn't rock slam.

You can prove things to a pc like that. Get them to own up.

All right. Now, supposing you had somebody list 850 goals. You just walked up to them and you said, "Oh, you're going to have some 3GA. That's fine. Swell. I'm going to audit you. That—that's good. That's good. Well, you'd better be getting your goals list in order." And they say, "Urp" or "Ulp" or "Yes" or something. You just keep on giving them the auditing command, you see? Out of session. You just want them to get to 850 goals.

Your first auditing action is to test it. Just keep kicking them in the head until you've got 850 goals. There's no reason to look at it or do anything about it until you've got 850 goals. And there's no real reason to spend any auditing time on the pc until you've got 850 goals.

This is just in the interests of saving auditing time. And you'll find out they will fool around and they will go a week or two without adding anything to it and oooh, they can't think of any more and that sort of thing. Well, naturally you could pull the—you could pull the mid ruds on the subject of listing. Clean up the mid ruds on the subject of listing and it'd help them out and they would go on like a bomb. Well, why do that? It's their life and their future. Why be so helpful? Say, "Well, the only thing at stake is your next 200 trillion years. Suit yourself" Usually it's just as good as a Prepcheck in the bag. And get your 850 goals on a list.

Specify that it must be on legal paper, that is thirteen by eight as paper normally is. It can be fourfold paper, that is two pages connected at the back. It can be lined or not lined. It is usually best if it is lined, legal. And one column of goals on it only.

And let it be legible. But have them do it legibly in the first place or have it typed by somebody.

For God's sakes don't have the pc copy it!

Don't let the pc copy His list.

Don't let the pc read his list.

Don't let the pc get in front of an E—Meter and see what's live on the list.

You just tell him to list and if he does anything else you'll have his thetan. You understand? That's quite important. The pc can turn on the wildest mess of somatics and get sicker than a

pup and be completely unauditable. And you'll say, "Good God, what's happened here?" Oh, nothing. He's just read his list over to see what's on it.

You see? That can happen to a pc. Don't discount it. He's holding in his hand a double—barreled shotgun with both barrels pointing straight at his head. You see?

Pc should not read list over to self Pc should not copy list. Pc should not go by self to an E—Meter to see if he can find own goal. Confucius say, he better dead. He better dead, man. I've seen a pc just 'op out, around the bend on this, you know. Pretty goofy.

In other words, he's at perfect liberty to write down his goals legibly on a legal sheet of paper so that you can read them. And that's what he is at liberty to do and that's all he's at liberty to do. And that works for any goals list he does. All right, now what do you do?

We've talked a lot about Prepchecking and doing this and that. Yes, it's a very good thing to have a pc very well Prepchecked by the Routine 3GA auditor. Very good. And have listing and goals and things like that cleaned up, as the first action. And as a matter of fact you could do just that, you see, with some pc who wasn't coming to you constantly. You could do a Prepcheck on goals, you see and then you send him off to do his 850 list. You see? That's a good plan of operation.

All right. He comes back to you and you read the first six goals and it goes bang! Wham! Bang! Eight hundred and fifty goals he's listed and it falls off the pin. As a matter of fact you're in fear of the Mark IVs life, that the pin will do a corkscrew. This list is charged. What do we do now? Well naturally you could list the pc up to 3,962 goals, couldn't you? But that is rather lengthy. Now, why? One, the goal isn't on the list. That doesn't mean you never null it. But the goal isn't on the list. That's the first thing you know. He's listing all four lines on one list. You see? He's the—he's the mixed—up kid. You see, he's putting them all down consecutive.

So, your first action on doing something like this—it doesn't matter really which—which one of these two actions is first: There's two actions here. But the first action which I would do on this is I'd get him untangled on the subject of which goal belongs where. And I would run the four lists with your goal on each list, with, "What goal might you have?" "What goal would oppose your goal?" "What goal would retard opposition to your goal?" and "What goal would pull back your goal?"

Now for sure somebody's going to think that we mean to put his goal in there. No, no. We mean just those wordings. Just that wording. We don't know his goal yet, see?

"My goal? Ho—ho! What? What? Who? What is it? I don't know what my goal is."

"Well, all right. Answer the question that's ... Yours is not to wonder why I am asking the question, yours is but to furnish me an answer thereunto so I can write it down on this sheet of paper."

He gives you four listed goals, suddenly. When he's given you about sixty on each list, you throw away three lists and keep one. Keep the first list and put it on his list that he's done. Throw the others away. You care nothing about them. They're probably not even accurately... See?

But the probabilities are in favor of, "What goal might you have?" as a list, adds sixty goals to his list. Okay? Got that? That straightens his skull out on the subject of what he's listing. You all of a sudden will have some fantastic automaticity roaring off, if you've—if it's gone like this, see.

And listen now, this is a good thing to do in any event. You see? This is nice to do in any event. Don't necessarily keep it to a specialized case. It's very nice because it straightens things kind of out for the pc. He's liable to have some fabulous automaticity roar off.

You say, "What goal would oppose your goal?" and all of a sudden all the bad nasty mean goals that he didn't want, that he was putting down on his list go tearing off He identifies them that fast as opposition goals and after that you don't have them occur on the list.

Now, don't think this is going to clear him. Don't anybody get the sudden idea, the sudden brilliant—now wait a minute, maybe Ron didn't notice this, but you know, if you continued that on to 4 or 5,000 goals on each list he'd go Clear ! Or suddenly his goal would spring out and he would know it himself without any nulling—because it's already been tested. It didn't work. You could list four lines of items just who or what would have your goal and that sort of thing, but before you've listed fifteen you'll wish you hadn't—fifteen on each list.

I mean that's—that's a thaaaagh, bluhhhh. In other words items listing, thinking that will go to Clear. It won't. That's been tested.

There's another system of taking a whole bunch of terminals "Who or what would have your goal?" See? Get a bunch of terminals and then assess those and find one that sticks in and then find goals for that terminal, see? That's awfully interesting but that hasn't worked either. I'm just telling you what hasn't worked too. There's been a lot of work in this direction.

Now, what's that do. That discharges the living daylights out of it. That gives him some idea of opposition goals and that sort of thing and it takes a lot of charge off the list in a hurry, see.

All right. Now let's get rid of all of the goals he thinks are goals but which are solutions.

Now, all goals that a pc thinks are goals, except one, are solutions to problems. All goals are solutions to problems except one. And that's postulated and it's not a solution to nothing. And everybody can sit around and regard their navel in contemplation here, trying to figure out how come a pc would have one sitting out in thin air that wasn't a solution to a problem, but I'm sorry but that's just the way the thetans that are here on this track at this time, are built! See? That's what they done. See? And until I find some other explanation for it, that's all. They just postulate. That's prime postulate for the universe of self And it doesn't depend on a solution to any problem. It solves nothing. He just did it. Just out of the goodness of his stupid little cotton—picking heart.

The rest of them, in any GPM—any given cycle or GPM area, are solutions to problems. See?

He gets beaten up by all the boys in the neighborhood, so he has a goal to beat up everybody. You see? That's a solution to a problem. To be able to punish at will. See?

He's been in jail now and then, up and down the track, so he's finally developed a goal "to escape." You see? And then he—this will go off into all kinds of odd panels, like "to escape the consequences of life," you see? "To get other people to escape the consequences of life." "To hate blue uniforms." You see? And they'll all be mixed up with this problem of getting put in jail. They're all solutions.

So the pc, well, he can figure himself crazy as to what is a solution and what isn't a solution, but you'll find that most pcs as they sit there, only accept as a valid goal that thing which they know will solve the problem they have: The chronic present time problem.

Now, we had these last year and they were getting in the road of our goals finding and they do get in the road of goals finding like mad. The guy's got a chronic present time problem. It actually hasn't anything to do with his goals line. It just happens to be a present time

problem. Of course it wouldn't be a problem if it was on his goals line. Think that over for a moment. See?

It wouldn't really be a problem, see, so it must be something else, there must be some other thing. Well, he'll sit there and give you a long and involved list of solutions to that problem and call it a goals list and it drives him almost around the bend, see. He keeps—because man, you try and run this something. Try to run this process on somebody, "Solve a___" "Think up a solution to your problems. Thank you." "Think up a solution to your problems. Thank you." "Think up a solution to your problems. Thank you."

Next thing you know the mass is getting massier and massier. He's wondering what's going on, you know. It brings the masses right in on him. "Think up a solution to your problem." Bum show.

Now a goals list, oddly enough, would be composed of past solutions so that would run them out. So that would be very therapeutic. But the guy who is sitting there with a chronic present time problem... Let us—let us say this fellow has a—has a farm. He has a big farm, see. And the government's gone bankrupt and can't run it for him any more and he's sitting there with cows and horses and sheep and wages to pay and everything and no subsidies.

And he's got this. And he's had this for quite a while. Morning, noon and night he's done nothing but think about this. Do you know what kind of goals he's going to get? "To dispose of sheep at a large profit," "to do lots of work," "to pull off miracles," "to be an economic wizard," "to make things grow better..... to make more production." See? They'll all have to do with his PTP. And you'll just get reams of stuff on PTPs. And this is why you develop these long lists because the person starts thinking up new solutions to PTPs.

So this is the gag: After you've done this four goals, that separates out the sheep from the goats and tells him which is him, to some degree, that smooths that out, takes some charge off the list, pull this other one: "What problem would your goal or might your goal be a solution to?" That is very charming. You make a laboriously written list of these things so you can throw it away.

But what problem would your—might your goal be a solution to? Whatever the wording you use. I couldn't care less. But it's what problem would your goal be a solution to? That's what you're trying to find out. You're trying to find out a list of problems.

And the guy says, "Oooh, this bird with the farm," he says, "Oooh." "To run a farm profitably," "To get my hands paid," "To make things better on the farm," "To produce agricultural machinery without paying for it," "To sell hay at high prices—how to sell hay at high prices in summer," "How to get cows milked for nothing."

And the next thing you know, why, he says, "What problem?"

You can actually sort of run this thing on down. And he'll sort of realize, "Ha—ha—ha, this has nothing to do with my goal. I mean that's all different."

So "might" doesn't hang him with having misanswered the auditing question you see, as "would" would.

Get yourself a nice list of problems. How many problems? I don't know. How many has he got? How many thousand? Oh, no. Nothing like that. Dozens is the order of magnitude of this problems list. It's just dozens.

And all of a sudden he'll suddenly realize that he's been sitting there waiting for a goal to... Now this is what's—this is what's the killer. This is not for getting the goal on the list. This is for getting nulling done. Because your pc is not going to pay any attention to his own goal as it goes by if it doesn't solve his chronic present time problem. He's waiting for a goal to

come up that makes farming economically feasible. See what he's doing. He doesn't give each goal as it goes by its proper weight and interest just as a goal. He's waiting for a specialized goal to come up. See? And he turns each one over as regard to his chronic present time problem. "Let's see, would this goal help me run the farm? All right. Well, this couldn't possibly be the goal." And right away goes sort of out of session, you see? He fades out on you. And he's all ...

"To catch catfish," you say. "Ah, no, that wouldn't help run the farm. No. To catch catfish, that isn't it." See? See it's a problem in attention. The guy's attention is so stuck on current track that he just can't hear anything. It's not that you will miss the goal. It just makes it harder to get. Because the pc's sitting there all the time he's waiting for how to make a farm, see? His whole problem, see, is how to make a farm solvent. You read off a list of goals, he hears a list of solutions to his chronic present time problem. He doesn't hear his own goal when it goes by because that's something that's long ago and far, far away and he ain't 'ad nothing to do with it for a long time, you see.

So it has nothing to do with his problems today and it's all invalidated anyway. And there's nothing you can do about it. See?

So this trick is to get his attention centered around for nulling. And that's why you make a list of these problems, you see. What problem might your goal be a solution to? And he'll give you all these wild problems.

Now, you can go on with this too long. You do—start doing three, four—hundred of these problems in a list and your pc's bank is going to start to get kind of gooey, because remember you're going up against the problem and to list problems is therapeutic but to repeat wrong goals and so forth, is not.

See? Because he's more or less inventing these goals. He's guessing at them and so forth. You'll find out that it will run itself out of the zone and area of therapy. Actually your tone arm starts going up kind of stickily. You can kind of follow it on the TA, you see, it starts getting a bit sticky and gummed up. You better come off it. But you've gotten that out of the road. Now you can ask him another question and add to his goals list.

"Now with all of those problems out of the way, supposing those problems were all cared for, what might your goal be?" And list some goals. Get the trick? Well, just supposing you had all those problems handled that you've given me now, we've got the list here. We're not going to tear it up in front of his face, but, we're going to lay it over here to the side: "Supposing you've had all those cared for now, what would your goal be?"

"Oh, well that's entirely different. Oh, yeah, what would my goal be if all those things were handled? Oh gee, oh God, that would be a ball. You know. It would be marvelous. To dance amongst the daisies, to whistle at blondes," you know. You get some interesting goals that he's had as goals.

In other words, that's just a method of taking a bulldozer you see and just shoving first with this four list, all the oppgoals off of his list so you haven't got that automaticity to contend with and then shoving his problem solutions that are chronic and current, that are really worrying him, off of the list and now you can continue the list until it's in this kind of shape so it will only give one tick every now and then. And you're not going to go up to 3, 4, 5,000 goals, see?

And all of a sudden the goals you start putting down after you've done these two tricks, see, these goals you get are going to be much more sensible. They'll look more like goals. You know they—"To communicate well," "To have a ball," "To get my own way," anything you could think of

It will be any usual goal but it won't be, "To turn all the firemen in Chicago into ibexes." That type of goal is never found on a pc as the goal, don't you see.

"To run and run and run and turn around sometimes and come back so I can see where I was going when I wasn't there." You seldom find that type of goal on a pc. You see?

Whereas you actually, in listing out things, when you start to run to your 2, 3, 4,000 list of goals, you'll get a lot of those things on there and they're just a waste of time.

So that's a way to cut your goals list down. So that sort of handles going on and on and on and on and on.

Now your next action—that's important because some goals lists tend to run awfully long before they are finally discharged and that helps them this way.

Your next action in handling your goals list of course, is to null by mid ruds. Now there's a very good idea to prepcheck before you do a nulling, any old goal that has been found rightly or wrongly or been hinted at or evaluated on the pc. Put those down ahead of the list. Any goal the pc has had. I don't care if it's been prepchecked before, see. You know, he had this goal—he was in a course—he was in a course some place a couple of years ago and he used to set goals for the session all the time and finally he put this down on his list and somebody found it on his list and it was in, you know, that kind of thing and they didn't ever really get it to pan out, but he thought for a long time that was probably his goal. Or something he was terribly fond of as a goal, that didn't pan out and he's been mad at it ever since. Or a goal that was found wrong and listed on him or a goal that was found and not listed or 3D Criss Cross was run on it. You see, any type of goal like that. Get a nice neat little list of them and put them down ahead of the goals list.

I don't care if it's been done before, don't you see, because in the meantime he's still going to have a fondness for those until his actual goal is found. And he's going to think of those once in a while. He's going to invalidate them once in a while and he's going to muck them up once in a while, see. And maybe his goal is "to get myself in a hell of a fine, ruddy mess," you know. You never know.

And he can sure do it with some old half—half—gone goal, see. You put that—just put that in front of the list.

All right. Now, you've got those things. Now clean those up and then start in. There's several ways this could go about, but kind of the way I would favor would be to run a whole prep—get those gone, see, and then just run all the mid ruds or any Variation of the mid ruds on your goal, (quote) "Your goal," (quote) "Your goal." That's a completely different Prepcheck. See? It's not "On goals" or anything like that, "Has your goal been suppressed?" You see? You get these things out of the way, these old ones and then let's do a, "Your goal," just to make sure. And it sort of gets the wheels straightened out. They've been going round and round maybe for—oh, for some people they've been going around for months or even years, "What's my goal? What's my goal? What's—what's—I wonder what my goal was?" And they finally go to fortune tellers, take up Ouija boards, anything.

And you just—you not only then get the known ones out of the way, but with this basket, you know, why you just get all the unknown ones that he hasn't mentioned out of the way, too. Just prepcheck it. Just as though you had it on the list. See?

So you'd have "To catch catfish," "To be a waterbuck," "To run and run and run and knock all the firemen in Chicago into cocked hats," and "your goal."

Get the idea? So that merely becomes part of the goals list, any old found or suspected or hoped—for goal you see, that's been worked over. Then this item, this goal, your goal, see, you're handling that in turn with a very careful nulling by mid ruds. See? You make sure that

you get it all polished up, see, so that it doesn't bang on anything. And then sail on into his list.

Now, because they've come off against a plot of time from early to late, in other words he's listed these things consecutively, there is an argument, a heavy argument in favor of nulling them that consecutively because you can keep them cleaned up more—earlier. See? The earlier to late. And you null by mid ruds from early to late. See. You've got your list now, now null again from early to late to approximate the cycle of getting these things off.

You could also make a case out of from getting late to early because it possibly would be in the greater number of cases that his goal would be late on the list rather than early on the list; but then we take somebody here the other day, I think, I don't know how early the goal was on the list but it was practically first page.

So that argument against it really isn't valid and starting from the beginning and going through to the end is the recommended way to do it.

All right. We tear on through that way and we clean each one of them up, as I was telling you about in the first lecture, and your pc should be looking as fine as silk.

Now when do we prepcheck this? Well frankly, if you do this trick, if you do this trick, you don't need to do too much prepchecking. When you've done your beginning rudiments if you will then run ordinary mid ruds before you go into the body of the session, with "Since your last session," see, not "In this session," you see, but "Since your last session."

"Now, when was your last session?" The fellow says, "Well, it was yesterday afternoon, we finished up at 4:30." You say, "All right. Good. Since your last session is there anything you have suppressed?" See? And do those repetitive, like you do the beginning ruds, you see. Don't do them a fast check, do them repetitive. Because the pc when he's doing goals nulling does mighty silly things. And we've already caught two or three fellows off—base who come in and they went out with the tone arm, you know, the tone arm was sitting there at 2.75 and they come back in with the tone arm at 6.4 and the needle is going bzzzzz and they say, "Now, since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding? That is clean, thank you."

They didn't do anything. They read their whole goals list and tried to find it on the meter. No, they haven't done anything, see? Ha—hah. Well they're not withholding it. They would have told you if you asked. They've just about thrown their case into a cocked hat, see. And people do silly things while their things are being nulled. And they get anxious and they get upset and they experiment around and they wonder if there isn't some easier way to find a goal. You can expect pcs to do all kinds of things like this. So in nulling sessions if you say, "Since your last session is there anything you have suppressed?" done repetitively. And then do a fast check afterwards. Fast check the mid ruds, see, on the same thing. Now you're sailing because you're not now going to have the interim time between sessions gumming up into suppress and failed to reveal and dirty needles and all of this other kind of thing. In other words you're sailing now and it's well worth doing it. And after you've done it a few times, why it is very easy to do. It's not a very lengthy action. I did one the other evening, I think, in about, I don't know, about seven minutes, it was whiz, whiz, whiz, whiz, whiz and it was all clean and everything went along beautifully.

All right, now. That is a very good thing to do for a goals types—nulling session, in other words, "Since your last session." Not "In this session," but "Since the last time you were audited," whatever you want to say. That thing is all clean. Now you've got that interim check, you see.

Now, if you only want to go through that once and so forth, you could do your fast check on the session. See. "In this session," brrrrrrr, see? And that caught anything he mucked up in—while doing the repetitive check, see. And that might clear that up. But that—this is now

getting very nice indeed because the pc by this time will practically be crawling through the meter to get onto his nulling. So you can be just so cautious without knocking the pc out of session on the basis of no auditing. See?

The worst auditing there is is no auditing. You know that. That is the worst there is. The worst auditing there is is not an auditor who cant read a meter, who will not do TR 4, who this, who that, who the other thing. The pc's opinion, I don't care if this ruins him, gives him somatics, puts him sick in bed, I don't care what this does to him—to him, no auditing is worse than any auditing.

That is something for you to remember. Because no auditing sometimes is what lies back of your pc's lack of progress. You're just being too confoundedly picky. You're just being too confoundedly careful. You're saying, "Well, I know we did a Prepcheck during the last three sessions, that we've been prepchecking listing as a subject. I know we've been doing that, but in actual fact, in actual fact, prepchecking demonstrated there that there was an awful lot of preparatory work to be done. So instead of nulling today, instead of nulling today, why we're going to go back over all of the Prepchecking we did and straighten that out."

Then you wonder why you can't get any rudiments in. No rudiments will go in now. You see? A pc will stand for so much but sometimes a no—auditing occurs in actual auditing and it's one of your chronic difficulties in auditing, is the pc is getting no auditing.

Now, when you start sailing on a goals list and start nulling on down the line, your own heart is going to be in your throat many times. You will go to goal number 789 and honest to Pete, this thing never ticks. There's hardly any valid ... You pick up the suppressions with a tiny slow and—and ha—ha—ha—hu—huh. Is the pc in session? Is the pc responding on the meter? What the hell is going on here? See?

Well, possibly a lot of things could be going on there, but I think it's just routine. After you've cleaned up just so many goals the pc stops invalidating them and stops suppressing them and stops doing this and that to them and you don't find much on them. But also a flying needle—it isn't the stuck needle that is the most vicious thing to encounter. It is the flying needle. That is your worst enemy in nulling.

A flying needle. One which is spinning from—let's say your tone arm is gently and gradually rising so that in the space of five minutes will go from 4.5 up to 5. Let's say it takes five minutes to get there. Do you see the relative speed of rise of your needle? Now that constantly rising needle, if rising above a certain speed, is a flying needle and a flying needle is one which is enough to cancel out the invalidations, the suppressions and the goals reads.

In other words, the mechanical inertia of the needle, the actual weight of the needle and the fact that it is flying there, from the right to the left, oh man, to detect a slow out of that thing is heroic. It's almost worth ARC breaking the pc so he'll stick, you know. Just drives you batty.

I mean it's a flying needle. It's just a constant rise. Constant rapid rise. And it is enough so that if your tick just degenerates into just the slightest slow and if anything is guaranteed to give you myopia as well as nervous prostration, it's one of these fast rising needles.

You're looking for that little slow. And then every once in a while to complicate the thing, pcs that have this sort of thing get a jerky rising needle. And it's going up by fits and starts and you can't tell what is a slowed rise, you see. And what is just needle pattern and so forth.

It's almost worth kicking the pc in the shins to change the needle pattern. See?

You can do various things about this but to attempt to cope with this situation very hard is, of course, no auditing. It's something that you should go through. The one thing you can't go through with is the dirty needle.

The dirty needle—very often the thing is latent which is a read and so forth. When a pc has just so many overts on an auditor, a dirty needle becomes rather chronic. And it slips and it slides with sudden jerks to the left and right and then starts buzzing, don't you see.

And those sudden jerks can have been going on, sort of, before you saw them. Do you get the idea? I mean they're not good and instant. They're not this, they're not that. Now if you take a magnifying glass on this and if you watch it very, very carefully with a magnifying glass, you'll probably be able to detect an instant invalidation or something like that inside a dirty needle.

Now I can do this and 90 round blinking for a week afterwards from the eyestrain. Actually read a dirty needle and read the vibrations inside a dirty needle in order to clean the thing up. It can be done, but there isn't any reason for you to do it at all, because it's O/W.

It's—now it's more 0 than W. Now when your pc is all the time, all the time, all the time withholding and they've always got a "failed to reveal" and they've always got a "failed to reveal," it's you that's auditing them, so they must have the overt on you. So let's put it in terms of overts now. Let's make a random rudiment out of overts. "In this session have you committed an overt against me?" or "In this session have you committed an overt?" or something like that.

And you all of a sudden see that dirty needle broaden out into a wider rock slam. And then murder will out. They actually repeat the goal to themselves several times after you do, while you're asking them suppress, in order to make sure or you know they're helpful. They've been doing something, you see. Or they've been talking about how lousy you are out of session or something like this, see. Something is going on here. That you can pretty well plan on. Your constant dirty needle if not traceable to the auditor is traceable to somebody else, but basically it would go like this: To the auditor, most likely, to auditors, you see, to Scientologists, to Scientology, to something else on a broader perimeter. Sort of about your scale of application of overts.

For instance, somebody could do this. They could be running beautifully, go by a reception desk in a Central Organization, steal a book and after that you wouldn't be able to straighten their needle out. Do you see that? Some auditor that you're auditing could get furiously angry at a pc and refuse to audit the pc and put the pc off and raise hell with the pc, don't you see? (Come under the heading of Scientologists. You might as well say, Scientologists and pcs there on the list you just jot it down.) And come back into session again: He's got a dirty needle. He's got a rock slam. You can't read this thing, you see.

So just put it down to this: It is overts.

Now there's a thing called a missed withhold, isn't there? Well now, just translate the whole lot into missed overts. Dones that they didn't find out about, see. And you've got basically the same situation only we've got the overt side of the situation, you see.

So the missed overt, done, that people didn't find out about and that sort of thing. You've got a lot of phraseology that can go this way.

Now, of course that necessitates running some O/W to clean that up, doesn't it? Now, let me tell you the difficulties with O/W. And one of the reasons why you have so much trouble sec checking and prepchecking people is they don't answer the auditing question.

They answer the auditing question because of... See? They answer the auditing question with something else. You say, "What have you done to your pc?" You finally isolated that pcs [auditors] are chopping their pcs to ribbons you see. "What have you done to pcs?" This is a field auditor in practice some place or another they come in and you are clearing them. And

they answer it this way, "I wonder why the pc acted up so." It's, "What did I do to pcs to make pcs act up?"

You see? That's not the auditing question. It's, "What have you done to pcs?" Not, "What have you done to pcs to make them act up?" And as long—now listen—as long as they answer the question with any additive, it will not clear. Now, that's well worth knowing.

And you'd better write that down very strong, because where O/W doesn't work, the pc is not answering the auditing question. And if you don't have a reality on this already, some day you're going to get a flaming reality on it. You're going to be utterly shocked at the fantastic, offbeat—you'll have run O/W for fifteen or twenty minutes and the pc is just getting more and more ARC breaky and you can't quite figure what the hell's going on here, you know. You haven't got any tone arm action or something like that. And then lightning will strike. And you will suddenly remember Ron telling you at some time or another that it was because the pc wasn't answering the auditing question.

And you all of a sudden decide to investigate even at the risk of causing further ARC breaks and find out what the pc is answering. And just explore this, just discuss this for a while. All of a sudden—it sometimes takes a pc quite a while to get disentangled from this thing, you know—you'll find out the pc was answering the auditing question with some via or additive, in some fashion that had nothing to do with the auditing question. Like, you're saying, "Now what have you done to women?" See? The pc gets a dirty needle or a rock slam or so forth every time—every time he has anything to do with women, see and he comes into session and you—it's all a mess, see.

Of course it's all on his goals line but you haven't got his goal. How the hell are you going to straighten it up? See? Your—your problem is to find his—is find his goal without having found his goal. See? And then you've got a rock slam and a dirty needle and so forth, so you're going to say to him, "All right, what have you done to a woman?" See?

And he's going to say—if you listen carefully there's always something a little bit wrong with the answer. "Well, I've—I've scolded them." That sounds all right to you. See? "What have you done to them?" "I have scolded them."

And you say, "All right. What have you done to a woman?" "What have you withheld from a woman?" Now, what have you done to a woman?" And very shortly they run out of answers. That's one of the phenomena. They run out of answers. They're back to scolded again. You see? And they just aren't getting any better. Now the index is and the only test you have is it isn't clearing up.

See? You're getting no tone arm action to amount to anything and it isn't clearing up. They aren't getting sweeter—tempered. They're getting worse. So what you can count on is they're asking—they're answering a question that sounds to them like this: You say, "What have you done to a woman?" See? And they answer it, "Why have I been a victim of women for so long. Is it because I have scolded them? Is that why women do me in?" And they're actually running solutions and they get no better. They run solutions to the problem of why they can't get along with women. You got the idea?

It's kind of like they do a little Goals Assessment on themselves. God help them. You see? "Why—why have I…?" "Why have I been the victim of women?" "Why have women chewed me up all the time?" "Why are women always stealing my car?" This is what they're trying to solve, you see? They're trying to solve a whole bunch of problems with relationship to women. Not what have they done to women.

And the solution to it is to say, "Now, look, look, the question is done, done, done, done, done, just plain done, done, you see, done, have you got that? Done."

And they say, "Yes. I've been a victim of…"

"No, done, done, see, done to women. Now get the idea of a woman there and you there and you've done something to a woman. Done. Just—just that."

And all of a sudden—you don't harass them this way unless they're getting worse on O/W, you see and you'd better harass them, see. And, "Done to women? I really have never done anything to women. Not really. Oh, hit them once in a while. Well, I guess you could call that an answer. Hit them. If that's doing anything to a woman. But, I guess it is. Hit them. Yes. Hit them. All right. That's an answer. All right, call it an answer. Yeah, that's right. I hit them."

And they sometimes will say to you, "But of course that doesn't have anything to do with my problem." And you have to go over it and you say, "Now look, we're not asking anything about your problem or anything, all we want to know is what you've done to women. Just done."

Oh, this guy will say, "Oh, yes. Oh well, if it comes to that, very often picked them up and dropped them outside of civilization and make them walk, you know. I guess that's doing something to them. Yeah, that is. That's doing something to them. And ignoring them. Mainly ignoring them. Yeah."

You've got a whole bunch of new answers. Now these answers go along. The pc gets cheerful and you get tone arm action.

Whenever you're not getting tone arm action on Security Checking, the pc is trying to solve a problem. Not trying to answer the auditing question. Got it? Either that or there is no answer on it. You know, you're just—you're checking a—you're checking a check list, a Sec Check list of Zero Questions for burglars. You see? And the pc is an editor. You know. It just doesn't match. His burglary is done in other ways.

So the whole situation you see is entirely shifted. You're not getting an answer to the auditing question or it doesn't apply. And you don't get tone arm action. The pc feels no better. The pc feels worse.

All right. That is actually your dirty needle. Now you can pick up some time when he had a dirtier needle; he had a dirty needle in an early session. You can, you know, you can flick, what was the withhold missed on him in that session? Bang! It goes out. And you're not troubled with it, you see. You can do other stunts to get rid of this thing. I'm just telling you what lies underneath these wide rock slams and chronic dirty needles and that sort of thing. And why O/W suddenly raised its head here a few weeks ago after being dormant for so long.

But O/W has that liability—is the auditing question must be answered or the pc will get more nattery and get worse.

All right. And if all those things are done, nulling and looking for a goal and so forth can be done rather easily, very successfully and without too much trouble. The pc's goal is on the list if the list is in the condition I've given you. You see, if it's limp and so forth, why his goal will be on the list and you will find his goal in spite of, "huhh huhhh," in spite of this, but sometimes you will run into this freak condition, there's a piece of the goals list missing or something wild like this has gone on and you will say, "Oh, no wonder!" or something. But I'd just do the whole list before I started worrying too much about special solutions to the thing. But sometimes you will, you'll have a piece of the goals list gone or something like that.

The pc brought in all the goals list except pages 2, 3 and 4. Ha—ha. After you're nulling at list number 759 why he says, "You know I found these on the dining room table the other day. They were mixed up in some sandwiches. I wonder if they're important," you see. And his goal is number 4 on page 2. But sometimes you're unlucky and sometimes you're lucky.

Well, all right. Now, I've given you a lot of extra data here on nulling and finding goals and checking goals out and that sort of thing. I hope the data will be of value to you. This has—I've given you very little about listing. I will have to cover that another time.

Thank you very much.

Good night.