3GA-LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS, PART II

A lecture given on
2 October 1962

Thank you.

All right. The wishing well is outside for your convenience. A crown, why, that's a wish for a good auditor, you see? And a half crown, that's to - hoping your goal will fire quickly, you see. There's a nice scale of rates here of one kind or another. And a florin, well, that's hoping somebody won't start screaming in the rest of the room, you see. There's rates of pay on this. It's very interest - . You'll find it's very workable.

Anyhow, this is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 2 Oct. AD 12, October. And we're continuing lectures here on listing 3GA - Listing by Tiger Buttons.

Now, your activity - now, hear me carefully - your activity as an auditor on a listing session has these responsibilities in an ordinary way: That you get the goal to fire and that the pc is not prevented from listing and you get the most items down that you can - it's quantitative. That you don't get him to overlist and you don't make him underlist.

Now, there's various ways that you could effect these various things and the first and foremost is you could get - be auditing with your rudiments out.

Now, let's be smart about pcs. We already know in Dynamic Assessment, if you're running any goal that has been gotten by Dynamic Assessment, you're fortunate because you have data on the pc. And I learned this myself just in the last twenty - four hours. I finally had to make up my mind about this, because, man, supposing you have a pc whose item is "floors." Now, look at this, man. The item is "floors." Now, this pc is going to run into a lot of floors. Right?

Now, take somebody whose item is "people." Or somebody, you know, or somebody whose item is "rain," and it's been raining for the last twenty - four hours, and so forth. Well, now, let's be smart about it, let's get intelligent about this. It isn't - you're not an adding machine after all, as an auditor or something like that. Let's take a look at this pc - this pc look all right?

Now, when I say that, I mean you take a look at the pc before the session begins. Go ahead and take a look at the pc. And the pc's sitting down and you're adjusting the chair and getting the can squeeze and all this sort of thing. Let's add something in there: Look at the pc!

Now, that might be new and novel, but you'll find out it'll pay very heavy dividends. You'll find out it'll pay very, very good dividends indeed. Your pc doesn't look as good today as pc looked yesterday at session end.

Now look, you don't have to have the pc on the meter and be studying the needle and studying the tone arm and all that. You don't have to hook him up to a battery of instruments to tell you that he looks sort of shopworn today, compared to how he looked yesterday. I mean, you already are a battery of instruments that ean detect this kind of thing, don't you see? In other words, look at your pc.

All right. The pc looked raggle - taggled and wogged up one way or the other. Well, what are you trying to do getting in your beginning rudiments without running O/W? Why don't you just start the session, run O/W, a few commands and so forth, and get - let the pc spit it out. You know, just general O/W and get the rudiments in before you put the rudiments in. Is there anything wrong with that?

And if this pc is normally quite withholdy and has a hard time regurgitating items and so - so, well, run O/W, put in the random rudiment and then put in rudiment one. In other words, ask the pc if you missed any withholds while running O/W, see. You get the idea?

All right. Let's not just sit there and run some kind of a rote. Let's put the pc in a state to be audited, see. Straightaway - bang! "Is it all right with you if we begin this session now? All right. Here it is: Start of session." See? "All right, what we're going to do here now is going run a little O/W on you, just a few commands." Hope factor, see; you've already told the pc, "Just a few commands, see how it goes, so we won't have to waste a lot of time on rudiments," you know - anything you want to say. "All right. What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld?" 'Ah - ooo - wa - woo - oo.' - '

All right. Now you've gotten down - the pc is in pretty good shape. All right. And you say, "Since the last time I audited you, have I missed a withhold on you? That's clean. All right."

"Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Clean." See? Clean as a wolf's tooth.

"Since the last time I audited, you done anything you are withholdine. You already got it. Clean. See?

"Do you have a present time problem?" Well, he did have. Clean.

All right. Roll up the sleeves and into a Tiger Drill. Get that goal firing.

Now, I've been taking sometimes as much as thirty - five minutes to get in beginning rudiments on a pc and I finally realized that I was wasting time, because ten minutes' worth of O/W in every case had finally had to be run after the agony. And actually tremendous quantities of time were wasted in the session trying to keep the pc in - session when I should have run O/W in the first place. You understand?

So your whole interest in a listing session is get the pc in some kind of shape so the pc can be in - session.

Somebody here suggested the other day that "under the control of an auditor" should be added to the definition of "in - sessionness," and I think this is a very wise idea. Willing to talk to the auditor, interested in own case and under the control of the auditor.

Now, there's nothing better in running up havingness and that sort of thing than a good, flashing dash of O/W.

Now, how much do you challenge those answers? How much do you challenge these O/W answers?

You don't, man, because you're using O/W to promote the thing. So the pc gives you six motivators and a victim. Fine! All right! Pc figures it's something they've done. That's all right. Because you're using O/W to get the pc to talk to the auditor about his difficulties. We don't care what the pc says just as long as the pc says something.

"What have you done?"

'I've breathed." Very sarcastic, see. 'I´ve breathed."

"What have you withheld?"

"Everything."

"What have you done?"

"Sat here and let myself be butehered up day after day by you!"

"What have you withheld?"

"My better self"

Get smart. Get smart. The pc is talking to you. Don't interrupt it for worlds for the pc will slide right on into session as nice as a fish going down a chute.

This one I gave this fellow I was telling you about, in Washington, when I suddenly said, "Well, to hell with this. There's no reason of knocking him appetite over tin cup." Made him sit down in the chair and take up the cans and you know the first quest - answers I got to my questions, "What have we failed to find out about you?" man, they didnt even vaguely resemble answers. But he was talking. He was talking. And remember, your in - sessionness; this contains that as a primary action: pc is talking to the auditor. Well, it doesn't even matter if he's bawling the auditor out, he's talking to the auditor.

You don't recognize that the only serious condition of a pc is when they sit there too apathetic to say anything to the auditor. If you've driven a pc down to that point, you ought to be spanked. You must have done it, because at some time the pc was talking to you and then stopped.

Well, what did you do to stop the pc talking to you? That's what you would have to patch up. Matter of fact, you could take somebody that had finally run down and won't say another word to you and won't utter anything to you and won't say anything else to you and is never going to talk to you again and is just sitting there blaaah. They're not mad, they're just sitting there blaaah. They're too weak; they just feel absolutely clammy on the subject of talking. They cant, and so forth. If you were to say something like this you'd be surprised; you'd surprise yourself. You'd say, "How did I stop you from talking to me?' See?

And the pc says, "Oh, well, you just wouldn't accept anything I said."

"All right. Good. How else did I stop you from talking?"

"Oh, you were sitting there, demanding I tell you things. I told you everything I got. There's nothing else. And . . . "

Look, get off of the significance, scenic railway, huh? It's beautiful - those rails going around the peaks and beautiful snow - capped vistas and forests and streams and waterfalls, and so forth. The significance railway, I mean, you know? To hell with what scenery, let's have some scenery. We don't care if this railway is going to start running through garbage dumps, see? We're not going to insist on the beautiful vista. Let's at least get the railway running, you see? Let's get those cars moving. We don't care what the cars are going to go through or how much they clank.

Some auditors are perfectionists. And they hear a screak in the wheels, you know, as the car starts up and they stop the car to oil it. And they've stopped the car, man, and that's everything there is to it. They won't get that train going again easily. See?

So the whole thing about a session is the pc's willingness to talk to the auditor. So in a listing session, this is terribly important. Because all doubt about willingness to talk to the auditor must be washed out before you start listing. That's real important. That pc shouldn't have any qualms about talking to you - no qualms at all, man, no qualms at all. Pc just talks to you.

You can always bring a pc out of missed withholds if the pc will give you any missed withhold or any withhold or any comment about missed withholds. If the pc will just talk, you can do something about it. It's when the pc will no longer talk that you're in trouble. So

you really have to have those rudiments in for a listing session. The best way to get them in: get the pc talking to you. And you'll probably find necessary far more often to run rudiment O/W in listing sessions than any other type of session. And it's so easy that you can overlook these things about listing sessions, see. That pc has got to be willing to sing.

Now, anything the auditor does that is offbeat, off - line or anything like that is going to prevent the pc from talking.

Now, in - sessionness, then, doesn't have the importance of getting the meter to read. Its getting the pc so the pc will be terribly interested in his own items and will be able to as - is them and get rid of them, bing. And, you don't overacknowledge; you don't underacknowledge.

What is acknowledgment? Well, it's to let the pc know you got it. And if you were actually to sit there and say, "Got it, got that one. All right, got it. Got it, got it, got it, got it, got it," it would be very effective. Of course, you don't. You say, "Good," and "Thank you," and so forth. But you've got to give the pc the idea that you're getting these.

Now, if you put your flat of your hand against the pc's nose and stop the pc while you very carefully look carefully at the pc like you're going to hypnotize him, see, and you say, "All right; all right now." Pc keeps giving you items, you see? "All right, now look at me. Now, all right. All right. Good!" I don't think you'll find that's necessary. You see, I'm being kind of hard on you, but I mean - these mistakes will be made.

Now, you want the amount - the amount of acknowledgment so the pc knows you got it. And that's how much acknowledgment you want. Well, that's how many you acknowledge. He gives you thirteen so fast you can't go back - you already checked them off here - but you should - you don't have to go back and count the number since your last acknowledgment and say, "Well, now wait a minute, now I'm going to give you a 'good' for each one of these." See? Those are all unusual actions. Pc has to be acknowledged.

Well, what is this? Well, it's what the pc considers being acknowledged is. Well, what is that? Well, it's being acknowledged. This is a human value. It's not a mathematical value; it's a human value. Acknowledgments aren't one - for - one or one - for - ten or ten - for - one. Some poor pcs get ten acknowledgments for every one item, you know? You wind up as - ising the pc, not the bank.

So keeping the pc talking to you is a question there of how skilled the auditor is in not getting in the pc's road and letting the pc know that the auditor has heard it. And that's the type of auditing you're looking at in listing sessions.

All right. Now, this getting the goal to fire - now, let me give that a little more stress: getting that goal to fire. Now, did you ever hear a pistol "tick"? Well, when you heard it tick it didn't fire, did it? That right? Well, that's what I mean by getting a goal to fire. It's not carelessly used. See? We want rocket reads on this goal, man. Now, of course, there's this dividing line: You can put the pc into a terrific anxiety if you can't get his goal to fire. I can show you how not to do it. Sit back . . . "Well, I don't know if it's your goal or not. I'm just taking you over from another auditor. I've never even ever seen the goal fire. Don't know whether it'd fire or not. Let's see, all right: to catch catfish. Well, it didn't fire that time. Heh - heh. Well, that didn't fire, so on. Who said this was your goal?" You see? And, "Somebody say this was your goal? Have you had any sensation on it at all during your listing with your past auditor?" Oh, well, that is just plain - plain awful.

You can slaughter a goal with the wrong Tiger Drill. Now, what you want to do with a Tiger Drill: just walk in on the goal and clean it up. See? Actually, as long as you're taking Tiger Drill buttons - it's Big Tiger that you use, by the way, at the beginning of session, not Small Tiger. On the sen side of the picture on this, why, you have three minimum and on the pain side of it you have three minimum. (PR go into that in a minute.) But you want Big Tiger -

you want Big Tiger. And you want that - you want that goal firing. And just remember this: that pistols that tick haven't gone off - they're not loaded. You want it firing. Now do you understand?

Now, how much is a fire? How much is a fire? How frequent must the goal fire in the three reads?

Well, let me tell you one of the things: You can work a pc up into an anxiety so you can get a rocket read, a half rocket read and a no read. You say, "To catch catfish." Rocket read. "To eatch catfish." Half a one. "To eatch catfish." No read.

Well, what's happened?

Pc is sitting there saying, "Did it fire?" You know? "Heh? Well, did it?"

You know, you say, "To catch fish. The goal fired."

And the pc says to himself, "Did it fire?" You know?

Then you say, "To catch catfish," next time and he half hears you.

And he's got the goal somewhat suppressed. And then says, "Well, God almighty! It isn't firing!"

And by the time you've read it the third time, of course, it's totally suppressed. That's the end of that.

Then you start in again and this makes the pc very anxious.

Mostly what you do wrong - and this is pretty uniform - is you don't keep a pc genned in. You run a secret on the pc. You run a withhold on the pc about what's happening. You can tell him with perfect honesty as long as you put in enough hope factor. That hope factor is quite important. You say, "Well, we'll get this thing to firing. Oh well, we'll get it to firing. Well, let's brush this one up and get it to firing so we can get going here," see.

Now, take any of those frames of mind and oppose it to this one: "Well, I´ll see if I can get it to fire. Well, IM try. You know, oh 'to catch catf - .' Doesn't look that good to me. All right." That's a no - hope factor - a no - hope factor.

No, you keep it riding - even if it doesn't fire. Why, you know this is the pc's goal. The pc has been getting pain on it and that sort of thing and it didn't fire. So you say, "Ah, well, all right, let's get this stuff off of it so it'll fire." Pc sparks right up and gets the stuff off it and it fires again.

"Well, I don't know whether I can get this thing to fire or not. I had an awful time with it yesterday. And I don't seem to be doing very good with it." That goal won't fire. In other words, you can predetermine whether or not the goal is going to fire by your attitude of getting the goal to fire. Got that? You predetermine whether or not the thing is going to fire by your attitude toward the job of getting it to fire.

This isn't necessarily true totally, but it also applies in finding goals. You get too desperate about finding a PC's goal and the pc will suppress all his goals. So you want to go into it sprightly. You want to go into it rapidly, brightly.

And you just, "All right, let's get the suppressions and stuff off this and get this thing firing." Or maybe it is firing today. Well, let's hope; maybe it is - maybe it's firing already. All right, all right. Let's see now: To catch catfish."

"Mm - mm," see?

"To catch catfish."

"Mm - mm."

"To catch catfish."

"Mm - mm."

"What are you doing?"

"Oh," pc says, "I just had such an awful time yesterday getting the thing to fire, you know. I'm just holding my breath. You see, if I hold my breath just right, like that, the goal will fire." See? "If I don't hold my breath, the goal won't fire."

Sometimes you can say, "All right, now the way to make a goal really fire is you hold that cigarette lighter in your hand there back of the can. And that's a good luck charm and that'll make the goal fire." And sometimes it will.

You follow your natural bent of, "What the hell are you holding your breath for?" Or even if you say it, it's better than nothing. But don't say to the pc rather patiently like they're a small child, "Well, you don't have to hold your breath to make the goal fire or not make the goal fire. Now I´ll take care of that." And so forth. That's reassuring, maybe, but it's on the wrong side of the ledger. No, give them something that they will consider ridiculous or take seriously. We don't care which way it is, now. Do something effective, in other words. You influence the firing of the goal. You know that you can make one fire through all of its suppressions and everything else? It'll just fire - naked, all by its lonesome, right out into the blue.

You say, "Well, all right, now, I'm going to read the goal so it will fire. 'To catch catfish.' That's firing real well. Thank you very much. Now we'll get on with the listing." That would be pretty short, wouldn't it? Well, you actually, the auditor, determine how short that will be by your attitude, your strain, your worry, and your lack of assurance, and so forth - and your lack of hope.

You want that goal to fire. All right. Then have it your intention to fire the goal. That isn't because you make the goal fire; that's because you intend to take responsibility for its firing. As long as the pc takes responsibility for the goal's firing, it wont fire because the pc is sitting there in a total, 'I've got to do something. I've got to do something. I don't know what Im supposed to do." You hear every pc say this: 'I don't know what I'm supposed to do in order to make the goal to fire. When you say this I don't know whether I'm supposed to sit here and not hold the cans, to hold the cans relaxedly, hold the cans carefully or if I'm supposed to sit up straight or so on and so on; if I'm supposed to think something, if I suppr - think something PR suppress it, if I don't think something I won't suppress it." You know the pc's frame of mind is pretty ghastly right at that point, see?

But why? Its only ghastly because you're making the pc take responsibility for it.

"Now I`m take full responsibility for the goal firing. You just sit there and relax. 'To catch catfish.' That fired beautifully. All right, we'll go on into the listing session now." That would be the shortest one on record, wouldn't it?

Nevertheless, when I say fire, I mean fire. Any goal will rocket read. Now, you can't expect a goal to rocket read three times in a row if the pc suppresses the second one and cancels the third one. See? That's too much to hope for.

So therefore and thereby, your action in getting a goal to read is in the direction of effectiveness. Don't harass the pc, don't worry the pc about it, but get that goal to fire.

Now the pc says, "Well, I have a whole bunch of items and let's not fool with the goal today."

You say, "Well, all right, let's not fool with the goal today. Good. Then I´ll just read it once and you just sit there. PR get it to fire. 'To catch catfish.' That fired. Fine. Give me the items." See?

See, you did what you were supposed to do. You would be surprised, if you will take responsibility for the goal firing, how often it will fire. And if you take no responsibility for it and harass the pc for it, how often it wont fire. You get this?

I'm just telling you some of the little tricks of the trade. This is completely aside from Big Tiger, which we will have other talks about and lectures on.

But, I've got to tell you that sen - sensation - this is the result of the pc being slowed down and not being permitted to list. And you can list a goal straight forward into total sensation. Now, I've already told you that. It gets to an all - sen proposition. Now, all sensation and the bank beefing up and the pc sick and nauseated are signs of a wrong goal when they're all present. But you can actually list a goal into all sensation without the bank beefing up and without the pc sick and nauseated. And when that condition takes place that is just knuckleheaded auditing. That is all. That's just preventing the pc from giving you items or being in - session. It's very easy and you can look for it.

Now, pain will turn off on a goal. Now, the way if - you tell if it's a right goal is the TA is moving and it comes down and the pc is cheerful and easily put into session, the pc looks good, looks young, there's pain on it, also some sensation, and the pc's bank is getting less and the pc isn't sick or nauseated and feels pretty good. Now, that'd be the signs of listing a right goal.

Signs of listing a wrong goal, of course, is the TA stuck up there at 4.5 or 5.0 and really stuck; pc ARC breaky, chop - chop, messed up; pc looks bad, looks old; there's no pain on it at all - it's all sensation; the bank is getting more solid and ridges are getting more solid and - outside and inside the body; pc is starting to get sick, nauseated; motion sets in - it's mainly motion - the whole physical universe starts going out of plumb and so on.

You want to know how it sounds? Just take some goal that isn't yours and invalidate hell out of it. Think of somebody else's goal and then go off into a corner and make a bunch of invalidative, critical, snappy, snarlish remarks about somebody else's goal privately to yourself. You can actually start throwing the corners of the room out of plumb. See, it's not your goal and you're gotten - getting overts on it and you can turn on sen yourself. I don't advise it, but that's - would be one way to find out how it feels.

Now, it's the responsibility of a listing auditor that he doesn't list a wrong goal. See, that's the responsibility of the listing auditor. You must not list a wrong goal! You must not do it!

So you get - this 114 - line setup is very carefully squared away on this basis: because it's Tiger Drill buttons, you're getting a sort of a running Prepcheck anyway which makes the goal ease up.

Now, that's fine. And if you get the goal firing at the beginning of every session and at the end of every session, the possibilities of your auditing a wrong goal drop to nothing. See, just by the fact of following these rules: get it firing at the beginning of every session; get it firing at the end of every session - of course, it's just going to tiger drill out of existence.

Now, a goal that disappears without producing a free needle on the meter was the wrong goal.

A goal that only rock slams and you can't turn on any rocket reads of any kind is probably a wrong goal.

A goal that ticks only when it's protested - these kind of things - when you only get the Tiger Drill buttons are out, does the goal read. These are the symptoms of a wrong goal.

And you mustn't list a wrong goal. So therefore you must get a goal firing before you list. You get this? See, when we mean fire, we mean rocket reads. Now, those rocket reads will reduce in size as a goal is listed, quite rapidly. They'll come down to about half the size. A good rocket read is about an inch - three - quarters of an inch, let's say, that's a nice rocket read. Threequarters of an inch. All right.

Your rocket read on that goal will reduce quite rapidly by reason of being discharged to about a quarter of an inch. You - but you still got a quarter - of - aninch rocket read. It's not quite complete but it's a rocket read. It starts out very fast and decays very rapidly - the motion of the thing. And it strikes to the right on the fall side of the E - Meter. Rocket reads always strike to the right.

Those that strike to the left are just the reverse side of a rock slam. And you push them just - they're wrong goals always - you push them just a little bit further, they go into a rock slam. You push them just a little bit further and the rock slam drops out; they tick, you clean up the buttons and they're gone. That's the usual course of a goal which at first reading strikes to the auditor's left as he faces the meter.

But you actually cannot forecast whether it's the right goal or the wrong goal until it has been made to fire properly.

Now, if you demand that a goal fires three times in a row, exactly right, with the pc sitting there without much faith in you, holding his breath like mad, worried stiff about the fact that you may take his goal away from him, you're nuts. You're just expecting the impossible. Don't you see?

But one way to do it is to put the goal in a sentence: "On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" Well, it read didn't it? But just because it only ticks in that sentence is not meaningful either, because you haven't got enough intention behind saying the goal. You understand that? That's no sure cure, but you notice the goal is reading within those sentences - feel fairly safe as you're tiger drilling.

You'll see a lot of peculiarities about goals. But don't expect that a real goal comes up, reads three - quarters of an inch, right on through to the day that it goes free needle, all of a sudden vanishes then and free needle ensues, because they don't. The course of a goal is more or less this way: a course of a goal is not down to tick. The course of a goal is full rocket read and often, as the pc isn't suppressing or being careful or something else, you can tell it's a goal because it's got a nice full rocket read. You list a few sessions or a couple of sessions, and so on, you've got maybe a quarter - half a rocket read, something like that to say, "On the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed, invalidated - ?" You see, right straight on down across those buttons burrrrrr. "To catch catfish," See. You got to learn to say that. Suppressed, Invalidated, Suggested, Missed - Withheld - because Fve given it to you, seeand Mistaken. You got to be able to say those with no read on any one of them. See, there's no read appears on any one of them and a read does appear on the goal. And that's the - called the Instructor's check. You can always tell if it's a right goal. You get no read on any of those and a read on the goal. And that's actually, later on, the only way you can tell a goal. You've got to make sure there's no read on any of those, see. You can even be fooled by that occasionally. He invalidates it before you get to Mistaken.

But if you're going to give that check, remember to get Withheld, not Failed to reveal, and Mistaken or you can't say it in sensible English. You have to clean on your Tiger Drill,

Withheld; and you have to clean on your Tiger Drill, Mistaken. Those are the versions that you can get all into one sentence that will make sense.

lf you get no read on those and you get a read on a goal, that's the goal, man. You're all set. If you get reads on those and reads on the goal, of course, the read on the goal is the read you got on those and on one or another of them. Or the absence of read on the goal is because Suppress is hot. You s e to how this little cat's cradle works out very neatly?

The only way you can tell a goal that's gone along the line for a long time is with an Instructor's check. That's the point I'm trying to put over to you. There's HCO Policy Letter form on it - possibly could be modernized a little bit.

All right. Now, the reading of the goal must occur before listing. And this will prevent you ever listing wrong goals.

Well, so you listed it wrong. You listed a wrong goal three days running. Well, that meant you tiger drilled it six times. You got it to read at the beginning of session, you got it to read at end of the session. By getting it to read at the end of the session, of course, you wipe out all the nonsense that might have occurred during the session on mistakes and all of that sort of thing and suppression on items. By doing that you obviate further Prepchecking on this unless the pc is really in trouble.

Now, a goal that ticks with a high tone arm - stuck. The goal ticks and the tone arm is stuck high. Well, you better explore this goal. You better look this goal over pretty darn good. And you better find out what were the conditions of its finding. That's the first thing you want to look for on some spook line like this. What were the conditions of its finding?. Did the auditor say, "That's your goal!" and the pc say, "No that isn't my goal."

Or just before the auditor read it off the list, the pc saw it upside down on the list and says, "You know, that's too - that's too much recent times. That's - that's - that's much too recent a time track area to be a goal."

And the auditor gets to it and reads it, doesn't pick that up and said, "Well, that's your goal."

And the pc says, "No, that's not my goal."

And the auditor says, "Yes, that is your goal."

And the pc says, "Huh - uh, that's not my goal." And, boy, you know that goal will read for months and years.

You got to go back and get that. See, you've got to get that Assert versus the Protest. You got to get the Suggest and the Protest off of that thing. That's a mistake, man, so that has to be big tigered out. You have to take it out with Assert and Protest. Now, it could be in reverse. The auditor says, "Well it can't be your goal because you're a woman and it says that the goal is to be a man and you're a woman and it can't be your goal. See?"

Some auditor, way back, and he did this assessment in upper Kokono County or something and it was done by an ex - PE member, you know. Now, this thing is really goofy.

And by God, you run across it in a session and then this is never uncovered and nobody does anything with it - you know that goal will read. The only thing - weird looking about the goal is it never rocket reads and it always ticks with the same tick. Or it always goes squriggle - with a little dirty needle. Squriggle. Bzzzzzt, bzzzzzt, bzzzzzt. And it never does anything else.

Now, a goal which is in solely by virtue of ARC break has a constant read. Real goals have a variable read. Got that?

So you see a goal that always ticks, no matter what you do - you read it to the pc with the pc asleep and on the cans and it still ticks. No matter what you do or how you read it, you always more or less get about the same read. Boy, you'd better be awful suspicious because that is not the way a goal acts.

A goal goes in and a goal goes out, and a goal rocket reads, and a goal ticks and doesn't read. And it does this, it does that. And the pc gets very nervous. And then you read it and it doesn't read. And then you read it and it reads. And then you clean it up and it goes: tick, splash, dirty needle. "Huuuh!" you say, "That's good. That's a real goal." You got the idea?

But the one that goes - always goes a thirty - second of an inch tick and a thirty - second of an inch tick and you say, "Oh, hell, this isn't your goal," and read it again and it goes with a thirty - second of an inch tick. And you clean that up - what you just said - and it reads with a thirty - second of an inch tick. You get the idea?

Goals aren't built that way. So the charge of "too constant" can be leveled at a wrong goal. And you get down to figure this thing out. Wen, this pc has listed it, suppressed items, done everything of this sort, has gone around trying to tell people that the goal must - this is actually a case - the goal must not be listed with "your" in the line. Actually the line would never clear; the line was protested. Every time the auditor read it, the pc protested the line. That line would never go clear until the protests were taken off of it. You understand? There was a "your" in it that shouldn't have been in it. There it was.

All right. An auditor says, "Well, I can't get this to go out. I guess that's your goal."

And the pc says, "What - I never even put it on the list. I've never heard of it before."

And then, of course, every time somebody tries to list this thing the pc said - tries to tell the auditor, "Look, this isn't my goal, I've never had this as a goal. It just came in this way, and I've just never had it."

And the auditor says, "Trying to chicken out." And consists (goes) on listing it, see. Hey, you know that confounded thing will tick and it'll tick and it'll tick and it'll tick but it always ticks the same tick. See how that constancy gets built into the goal?

Now, you - it doesn't take any vast Prepcheck to strip this out of the goal. Let's just get slippery, let's be good auditors. What do you got? You got a chain? You got a basic on the chain. What's the basic on the chain? First time the goal ever appeared to the pc´s attention. When was it? What happened? Bzzzzt - bzzzzt. All right. The whole thing will rip up and it will no longer read. That goal is out. See? Nobody expects you to sit there by the hour to find out if it's a wrong goal. Let's get smart in our old age, huh? In other words, it doesn't take forever to tiger drill a goal, is what I'm trying to put across to you.

Did you ever hear of directing the pc´s attention?

"What happened when this goal was originally found?"

"Oh, well, a lot of auditors have gone into that. And I always tell them all the same thing: It's not my goal."

And you say, "Thank you. Thank you. Now, what happened when this goal was found?"

"Well, I always tell auditors it's not my goal. 'Tisn't, and so forth."

"Yeah, thank you. Thank you very much. Thanks a lot, I got that now. Now, what happened when the goal was found? When was it found? When?"

"When? Oh, it was found last summer."

"All right. Good. Thank you." Got him talking. Ha - ha - ha - ha - ha. Got him to answer. We'll take him right down to the ARC break that makes that thing read. Ha - ha - ha. They go bzzzzt - no goal. See?

Or if it is the pc´s goal, even though the pc said it wasn't his goal, and so forth, it'll start rocket reading when you get the basic disagreement off of it. In other words, a goal can read by basic disagreement as well as by rocket read, but a real goal reads occasionally by a rocket read. Once in a while it reads by a rocket read - once in a while.

So you'd better see a rocket read before you start to list. Got that?

Now, as you sail down the line, one card at a time - you've got the cards all stacked up in front of you and your derringer laid along - oh, no, that's another game. You got the cards all stacked up in front of you and you got your pencil ready and you're reading off the line - now, the first time you go through these things take them up with the pc and. .. Doggone you, don't get in any arguments with the pc over these lines, because it'll act just like I've been telling you about the goal. I've been putting on the coal about how invalidation or protest or something can make a goal read forever. Well, it'll do the same thing with the line. And that line will never go free. And one day you'll get back there and by golly, you've got 113 lines free, but every time you say, "Who or what would not help suppress a catfish?" the meter reads.

You'll have to prepcheck that line. You'll have to big tiger the line. Now, the best thing to do is to follow it down to the first time that line ever appears and you'll find every time, exclusively, that that line was the subject of a roaring argument that wasn't pulled in the session.

So if you get into an argument about a goal, let's get the argument off the goal. And if you get into an argument about a line, let's get the argument off of that line - both the right wording and the wrong wording.

Well, we had a pc around here for a while that went out and told everybody his goal was plural. And his goal was actually on the list as singular. And nobody prepchecked or nobody tiger drilled both the plural and singular goals because the singular goal may have been the right one, but that being the right one was the only one that was prepchecked or tiger drilled. Do you see that as an error? You've got to take both of them. See, you've got to take the wrong line and the right line. You've also got to take the wrong ...

Supposing the pc had a misapprehension. He thought his goal was "to secure elephants." He went around telling everybody his goal was "to secure elephants," when as a matter of fact the goal was "to keep elephants." Hey, this puts a bad mistake on it. He finally finds out his goal is "to keep elephants." Well, if you let "secure elephants" ride, you're going to have the goal line messed up one way or the other, because he isn't sure now. You've got to tiger drill this goal to "secure elephants" and it'll go out just in that much Tiger Drill. See? It's just out right now practically if you pay attention to this fact.

So you get into an argument when you're writing up lines on a pc and giving him lines and constructing lines and boy, you've had it. By the time you've added five or six versions of this line and tried to shove each one of them down the pcs throat and the pc has protested each version of this line, you have now six versions that will have to be tiger drilled in order to make the line go free at the end of processing. You got it?

So, don't be a knucklehead, man. You can dig your own grave. So just don't get in arguments about lines.

How do you keep out of arguments about lines? Well, you're supposed to sit down and compose the pc's lines, originally, in the first place, so they'd make sense.

All right. Look them over. These lines - the old lines, the create lines, the fifty lines, and so forth - were too hard for auditors to do. This has got enough lines so that a few inevitable errors that will steal into somebody's line is not going to louse up clearing.

When I say that, you're going to run lines five to eight on the effect wording of the goal. See? All of you have been doing this. You've been listing those things as cause, see. You've been specialized in the cause side of the goal and never list the effect side of the goal. See? "Who or what would want to find? Who or what would want to be found?" And you'll neglect the "Who or what would want to be found?" And you say, "Who or what would really

want to find?" and think you've got the effect in, see. It's not, see.

Well, you could make that mistake and it's still an answerable line and the line could still go awry and you'd still produce a Clear, see?

So I've built in a bunch of possible errors. But this one can't be built into anything. Get in an argument with the pc about the lines. Oh, no! See? You come to this thing and it's - you come to this thing and it's: "Who or what would goaling (blank)?" and you're running Suppress. See? And the goal is "to be" and you say, "Who or what would 'to be' (blank)? Who or what would 'to be' suppress? To be suppress. Well, all right. Yeah, we'll leave that in. Yeah, that looks all right." You've got to clear these things the first time you take them up with the pc.

Don't - you list a line - the first time you're going through these lines

you take it up with the pc, you list it, then you turn it over and you take up the next line with the pc. In other words, you've got to clear those commands. You just ask him, "Is this line answerable?" And if it's not answerable don't get into a dog's breakfast on the thing. Make the changes he says unless it knocks the whole thing into a cocked hat and then delicately point this out. But, man that's delicate. And if you invalidate, run it off right there: "On this line has anything been invalidated?" You got it? Don't leave it sitting around because the line won't go clear.

Get in - if you do get in an argument about a line, tiger drill the argument, tiger drill the line - right now. Don't let it pile up because it won't ever list.

You say, "Who or what would 'to be suppress?' Doesn't - isn't grammatical: 'to be suppress,' so we'll put it down: 'Who or what to be suppressed?' No, that isn't right. Well, IM take it up with the pc because I don't understand it and maybe the pc will."

Well, that's wrong thinking - you'd better take a look at that thing.

Many of you've turned sen on organizing some other - some pcs lines? You do to some slight degree, you know. It's all right - runs out.

But you can do anything you want to with a wrong goal except list it on yourself, you know, I mean. You say, "Who or what would beingness suppress? Who or what would beingness suppress? Who or what would being suppress? Who or what would being suppress? And then we've got another line here: Who or what would suppress being. Oh, well. Who or what would be suppressed by being?" And then, "Who or what would be suppressed by being - no, that's the same line. Who or what would get suppressed if you were? No, that isn't right. Who or what would be suppressed? Who or what would get suppressed if you be?"

And you finally make up your mind to what it is. See? You come along and the pc takes a look at this - he's already wogged; don't give him too much of a one to run into. And he: "Who or what would get suppressed by be?"

"By being," he'd say, "being is right."

"Who or what would get suppressed by being?" All right. All right. We'll answer it that way.

The funny part of it is, you're not going to go too far wrong. You're going to go much further wrong if you involve it in an argument. Got the idea? Make it so that you yourself can think of an answer to it without self - auditing on the thing. And then if the pc says he can't answer it, then doctor it up so he can, but avoid arguments on the thing because this thing is listing in wealth of lines. You've got enough lines here so that you've got a wealth of lines. You've got lots of them. Unless, of course, you muck them all up with an argument and if you do that, then he'll never go Clear.

Now, if you want to know why some line isn't going clear - 113 lines are going clear but, "Who or what would worrying - who or what would worrying be?" - that line, he's always had trouble listing it. "Who or what would worrying be?" He always seems to have trouble listing it. The line isn't going clear; the line is stuck.

You'll finally find out that you don't have to clear that line. What you have to do is tiger drill it: "Who or what would worrying be? On this line has anything been suppressed?" See? Tiger drill it. All of a sudden the Tiger Drill comes out and the only thing that was holding the whole line in - was not the items left on it because they evaporated out from under it on other fronts. Yeah, the only thing you had left on it was a stuck line.

Now, at the end of listing, what happens? It's just lines, one after the other, go free.

What do you do with a free line? Well, for the sake of formality, you can ask them to give you a single item as you go by them or you can say, "Well I'm just testing this - see if it's free and if I get a reaction here you can give me an item. Is that all right?" And you read the line, but you don't press this on past a free needle.

And when they're all nice and free, when all the lines are free on the thing, another phenomenon should take - took place and that is, the goal should kind of go "pop." Pc will have some cognitions concerning the goal. If these cognitions concerning the goal never occur, the goal is still in.

"I thought it blew today." You will get so tired of hearing this from pcs, you could spit. They come into session every morning and say, 'I thought of a couple of items last night myself. I put them down here on a piece of paper and I know it blew the goal. I felt it go."

You put him on the meter. The tone arm is at 7.0, you see. They're always feeling it blow. Well, when it really does go, then they don't feel that it went - they don't. They'll say, "Well, when I was there - oh, I won't give you the cognition. Heh - heh - heh - heh - heh. I won't give you the cognition. You'll have to find that out for yourself"

Now anyway, there's the extent - the extent of listing and I've tried to give you the conditions under which listing should be done; what you're supposed to do and the purposes of it.

If you find out that trying to get the goal to fire at end of the session is too confoundedly difficult and that sort of thing, well for heaven's sakes, the next time you tiger drill it, take it before the date of the session. See? Take it since Wednesday if your session that you couldn't - didn't have time to finish really getting it to fire at the end of session - that was on Thursday. Well, the next time you tiger drill it on Friday, take it from Wednesday. See? "Since last Wednesday, on the goal, to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" In other

words, clued the other session in that you didn't get it to firing and you'll have very little trouble if you keep this going.

Now, all the preventions I can think of are in this, all of the actions. The goal itself is very meaningful to the pc, very precious to the pc. The pc figures the wording of it and so forth has got to be very exact. But in the truth of the matter you can almost have 20 percent of these lines written wrong as long as they make some kind of sense and could get some kind of an answer and the pc will still go Clear.

Now, there's the Tiger Drill and tigers must be fed, so we have the rabbit effect. And the rabbit effect is, of course - the girls probably won't understand this too well, but the boys do - I mean, the rabbit effect, of course is - it's very suggestive because it breeds lines. See, that's why it's a rabbit effect. You got a rabbit. The pc is - he's had this minuteman - minuteman. You know? And does a minuteman fit here? No, it doesn't fit there. Now, a minuteman, a minuteman - he's always had this minuteman. He finally tells you that minutemen subvert. Oh well, give him a break, put subvert on the list. That's how you handle a rabbit effect.

Well, what would be the relationship of a minuteman to the goal so that you can't get it on the list?

Well, he'd subvert things. Wouldn't do anything else. He wouldn't damage and he wouldn't agree with and he wouldn't destroy and he wouldn't create and he wouldn't withdraw and he'd subvert.

Well, that's only when you get a spare item. Don't get inventive unless the pc gets in trouble. The rabbit effect will then take place and breed you out of existence, because it immediately and instantly gives you six more lines. One rabbit gives you six more lines.

You say, "Well, what does a minuteman do to beingness?"

"Well, he subverts beingness. That's the only thing there can be."

Now, I wish to call to your attention that a lot of old ghosts have arisen and that Routine 3 really is Routine 3. And this is all very amusing, but you're looking now at the reentrance of the Prehav Seale back into Routine 3. This is a bobtail version of the Prehav Scale and I studied the Prehav Scale for a long time to find out what buttons on it were important in goals. These buttons certainly are.

The most important buttons are, of course - are ordinary Tiger Drill button. But these buttons would be very important to run.

Now, you can change the sense of this by changing - by - well, take Agree with - Agree with: "Who or what would a rabbit agree with?" To be a rabbit's goal. "Who or what would a rabbit agree with?"

And pc: "Got to get it off - got to get that - in other words, it's to - toyeah, I can answer that. Who or what would a rabbit agree to?"

And you say, "All right. Well, give me a sample."

"Well, he'd agree to a rabbit feeder and he'd agree to this - he'd agree to various types of forms. To agree with - he wouldn't agree with anything at all. He'd only agree to."

All right, use "agree to." See? Don't get involved in an argument on the thing - pc won't lead you too far astray.

Now, that's about the - that's actually - with the data that is in this bulletin, which hasn't been fully covered and the actual lines themselves, the actual buttons themselves, and a few other things such as your Model Session - just about wraps up how you do a listing session.

I have tried to give you the one thing the bulletin doesn't give you - that is, how you ask for them and what you do and how the Tiger Drill works and what - what you handle and then what's important about a listing session and so on.

There's only one thing I haven't said. I haven't said whether you bring the list into parity finally or not and somebody's going to be worrying about that. Well, if the pc goes free needle on all lists without you bringing them into parity, I am very happy. But your ticks will show you that a pc, if he's jamming, is probably jamming on these items that don't have any ticks on them at all. And the main ones that you've got to keep parity for are the first twelve. They've got to be in fair parity. They've got to be of somewhat equal length.

But you'll find out that he inevitably scouts "oppose" all the way through. And that line on final test on 114 lines for free needle, sticks. You can go through those cards and find out, well, of course it sticks. He never listed anything on it, so there's something wrong with it or he never gave you any items for it.

So you straighten out the line. 'Is this line answerable?" you say to him.

"Well," he says, "yes," he says, "but nothing would oppose a rabbit. Nothing. Nothing - nothing would oppose a rabbit. Nothing. Nothing."

Well, give him a clue. You know? You say, "Well, all right. I´ll take that as an answer - nothing."

"Oh," he says, "that is an answer, isn't it?"

"All right. Let's give me some more," See? And coax him out and bzzzt and bow and bang and bang and bang and bang, and zoooom! And all of a sudden this hold - out line will go free - merely because you can see very clearly its wording and the fact that it wasn't listed very much, so there must have been something happen to it.

And at the end of clearing, which is the end that you'll be worried about, you'll find out those lines won't go free that haven't got anything on the cards. And there's something wrong with their wording, so a good auditor can take those cards and he can straighten those cards out and he can straighten those lines out and he can find anything and he can get the few items left on them. And he can actually take everything else out of the deck, except those few lines that didn't have very much on them; bring those things up to date and they'll go free needle too. Savvy?

So you need that for your tally work. So that's the way that thing is put together. It's more complicated, perhaps, than you might have wished.

There have been people that since 1950 have been dreaming that they won't have to take any responsibility or have any auditing or get off any - I think it's to get off any withholds - in order to get a Clear.

And somebody would walk in with a horse syringe and thrust it into the gluteus maximus, press the plunger authoritatively, and they would go "Whee!" and they would be Clear.

Well, I can call your attention to the fact that man has been trying to clear man in this way and with other things for a very long time and it has yet to be effective.

Now, even though this is a little more complicated than you would ordinarily look for, compared to a horse syringe and so forth, why, you aren't spared any of the difficulties that you would be spared with a horse syringe because the pc will scream on these lines, too.

Every once in a while the pc will let out a piercing little "Yeeeep" you know. And sometimes the pc falls out of the chair and writhes on the ground.

So what? You'll find out the pc will go Clear if listing sessions are done somewhat as I`ve told you tonight.

Thank you very much.