

HOW TO DO A GOALS ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on
12 June 1962

What is the date?

Audience: Twelfth.

Twelve June, AD 12. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture 1.

All right. Yeah, you're very fortunate to hear this lecture tonight for several reasons. There's (1) I'm very busy writing the basic text on these things now and (2) is, why, I feel lazy. But you need the material, so nothing is too great a sacrifice. I will go on and give it to you.

But it's very, very fortunate for you to hear this lecture because I am – got a plateau and every once in a while, why, some piece of Scientology can be wrapped up and you say that's that. You've seen several such pieces wrapped up. you have Havingness, Prepchecking – these things are all wrapped up. Model Session is in its final version. I'm writing it now. It mostly consists of corrections that have already been published, but the material is simply being released in one concise bulletin, and of course, “In this session” precedes everything, you see, rather than ends it.

I am satisfied now that Model Session used with middle rudiments, and so on, is a very close to perfect auditing form from the viewpoint of a pc. That is, nothing goes wrong that doesn't get handled, providing the auditor does it and can read a meter.

We've got the meter pretty well wrapped up. I knew there was a bug in the meter on account of people weren't being successful here and there, so there must have been a meter bug. And sure enough there was. They didn't know that an instant read came after the thing – after the line was uttered. The instant read never occurs before the last consonant – I like to get in plugs about instant reads because some people have to be told it a lot of times. It's after the last consonant in the sentence or, if a vowel comes last, after the last vowel.

I just had a couple of old-time auditors make a mistake on this – I mean a couple of very expert auditors make a mistake on this. They were checking out a goal that didn't check out on me. I didn't think it – it didn't look right. It didn't sound right. Didn't have enough track with it. Didn't sound like my goal so I got a subjective reality on it. It was “To conquer

Earth.” No difficulty with conquering Earth. Had it conquered for thousands of years. But couldn't be a goal. They were reading it “To conquer.” See? “To conquer,” instant read. And you look that over, “To conquer Earth,” see, and an auditor can say, “To conquer Earth,” and watching his needle, the “Earth” and the needle can coincidentally act, you see? So because you can say “Earth” so fast, of course, it must have been an instant read for “To conquer Earth,” except the needle was moving while he was saying “Earth.”

For an instant read to have occurred and for that to have been a valid read, the instant read would have had to have begun at “h” of “Earth,” not at “E” of “Earth,” see. And that is how cotton-picking precise you've got to be in reading an E-Meter, see. Now that was a wrong goal. Couldn't have been wronger. And the word “conquer” had a little charge on it. But apparently what made it hang as a goal was that it was the wrong goal. That's simple. You know, pc's disagreement and all of this sort of thing and the pc invalidating and everything and it messed up into a wrong read. But that's a fascinating one, isn't it, that the needle starts moving with the “E” of the last word and we get an entirely wrong goal.

Now, a right goal is terribly important. And if you can read a meter, it – reading a meter is a very precise action. It's not a sloppy action. And if you can read a meter and if you can prepcheck and keep rudiments in and if the pc has been properly prepchecked and brought up to a point where he can be audited, you can do a Goals Assessment, providing you do all these other things. But this is the touchiest action in Scientology, bar none.

And the name of this lecture tonight is “How to Do a Goals Assessment.” I've talked about the final version of Model Session. Well, this is, as far as I'm concerned, a final version of how to do a Goals Assessment.

I'm studying this thing for quite a long time, trying to find out what people were doing wrong. After this, if you do something wrong with it, I'm not going to learn a thing from it, so you might as well do it right. It'd just be a wasted wrongness. I won't pay any attention to it at all. I'll just tell the Instructor, “Make them do it right.” You know. *Baah*.

Now, the method of doing a Goals Assessment – quite precise. You probably could do something else than how I'm telling you this and possibly get the right goal. And on some pcs could do it easier than this. you understand? But at no time would I be comfortable that you had gotten the right goal.

And getting a wrong goal is so appalling, listing a wrong goal is such a wrongness, that you'll wish to God you'd never begun it by the time you wind up on it because you're going to throw the pc into fits.

Now, if a psychologist or psychiatrist, God forbid, ever started fooling around with Routine 3 in the University of Illinois where they copy Scientology and release it to United Press – alter-ised – Dr. Hungt there reads our books and releases them to United Press quite

often. He's now decided – don't think he's very bright, man – he's now decided that children's intelligence could be raised. And all these years afterwards, he has now learned out of all the burden of Scientology he has read that intelligence can change. I think that's a masterpiece. What intellect! Makes him one of the brightest psychologists in the world. He was able to misduplicate and come out with some sort of a minor fact.

But if a psychologist or psychiatrist ever started fooling around with Routine 3 at the University of Chicago, pulled another gag of trying to take Book One and read it for ten minutes and then audit some people and then find out they didn't go Clear that afternoon, you know – that's the way they tested it – now don't, don't underestimate what I'm saying: they could probably kill or make insane a patient. Let's not underestimate Routine 3. It'd take as much wrongness as those jerks would be capable of to do this. A mere Book Auditor couldn't do it, see. That's right. He couldn't make that many professional mistakes. You know, Evaluate, evaluate, evaluate, evaluate. “Oh, that isn't right. No, I don't think you could there. You sure your mother doesn't have a different goal than that? Are you sure that doesn't trace back to a childhood deformity?” You can hear them now, you know.

A fellow says, “Well, I wanted to play a harmonica.”

“That's an oral action. Are you sure you don't have some homosexual goals?” Then they choose one of their own choosing, don't you see. And then they would list it wrong, and then they would ARC break the whole list, you see. And if you did that to that clownish degree that only such characters would be capable of – I'm not just being sarcastic. Only they are capable of it. Ordinary citizen wouldn't be able to figure out this many twists – they could either kill or drive insane a person. So you're not fooling with something with Routine 3 – any of the Routine 3 processes.

You list a wrong goal and you've had it. That is to say, the pc isn't going to die or go insane, but – on your hands – but he's liable to get awful sick. And he's liable to get dizzy. He's liable to feel quite spinny. Listing a wrong goal is not just agin the doctrine of Scientology, but it's agin the mechanics of the pc's bank.

I'm not going to attempt in this lecture to give you a full parade of why Routine 3GA works and why you have to have a goal, beyond saying that the goal is the prime postulate. It is the prime intention. It is a basic purpose for any cycle of lives the pc has lived, see. And reference is *History of Man*, cycles of lives.

Now, you get a cycle GPM and then a whole track GPM or a track GPM, you see. you could get a cycle GPM. Now, actually, the smallest cycle that you will see a goal and a prime postulate operating in, is you ask the pc, “What was the most severe operation you've had in your life?” and he says so-and-so. You just ask him for an engram, see. And you say, “All right. What goal did you have immediately before the engram?” And he will give you his goal just before the engram and then – if you did it very lightly – because otherwise it's liable to

restimulate the bank because, of course, it's not a basic goal – you could actually disintegrate, probably, the engram itself just by getting the four-flows mechanics against that goal. See? That is your tiniest Routine 3, see?

A guy has an engram. He was in an automobile accident. “What was your – what was your postulate? What were your – what was your goal, idea. . .” and so forth. Immediately at the beginning of that accident, that will be the goal for that period of time. And any way the goal is not executed will be an alter-*isness* which creates a solidity, and that *is* the mechanics of an engram. That is how an engram suspends in space. It is the alter-*ised* prime postulate. And any alter-*isness* of that goal, you could call it, brings about a suspension of mass. The only way you get mass is by alter-*isness*.

Now, there it applies to an engram. I don't – I don't invite you to take engrams apart that way, because you're going to miss here and there. You'd have to do a little Goals Assessment at the beginning of the engram, don't you see, and work it out. Possibly you'd get away with it, but it might be so far – he might have been so far out of valence at the time the thing occurred, and it might have been such an automaticity of circuitry, that you might have a goal which, if it were the wrong goal... See, you might not be able to reach his actual postulate, and if you listed for that little engram – the wrong goal – if you listed the wrong one, you would get a further solidification of the engram.

Now, you can do this with a life. All right. Just before you picked up that body, you had a goal. Just before, see? Bang. You had a goal. Now, that goal may have been carried out to some degree through the life or it may not have been. But to every single point that the goal was not executed, the person was doing something else during that lifetime. And in doing something else during that lifetime, mass was created in the mind, in the bank. So the lifetime finally winds up to be the accumulation of that mass which takes on a spherical shape with a hole in the middle of it, and that is your basic item on the track. That is a basic item on the track.

In other words, it begins with a goal for that lifetime. Now, I don't say that you again could do this for one lifetime – easily. You'd have to make a little goals list for the goals just before assumption in this lifetime. And you'd have to make a little list and do an assessment and that sort of thing And you might come up with something. You might run out this lifetime; you might not. But this lifetime may be in opposition – the whole lifetime and that goal – might be in opposition to the basic cycle goal the fellow was running on, at which moment you would just get a beefing up, a growing of the mass. All auditing then adds to the mass of the bank. The net result of auditing is to make the bank beefier. Now, this is the basis of the Step 6 phenomena.

The Step 6 phenomena never occurred because of creativeness. It only apparently occurred because of creatingness. When what you are asking the pc to do was at great

variance with the basic goal of the pc, you've got an increase of mass in the bank by reason of mocking things up. That's why it didn't happen with everybody.

Well, let's give you a gross and improbable example: Supposing the basic purpose of the individual was "not to be audited," and you were auditing the person, you would then get an increase of the bank. you get the idea? All of this is that – is that idiotically simple. The mass which is contained in the bank depends upon the amount of alter-itness of the basic purpose of the person.

Now, there is a basic purpose, as I've shown you, for each engram. It's always before. Just like the instant read is always all the way afterwards, so the basic purpose is always all the way before – *all* the way before. It doesn't occur five minutes after the accident begins. It occurs before the accident occurs. It'll be there. The guy decides to have an accident or something like that. Usual. It's hard to find. So it occurs before the engram. It occurs before the lifetime. And it occurs – a basic purpose occurs before a *cycle* of lifetimes. A cycle is a similar or related series of doingnesses.

You know. It all happened in Arcturus. A guy is sixty thousand years in the vicinity of Arcturus, see. Well, that's a cycle. Then he decides to hell with Arcturus. Can't stand it anymore. He's got so many overts on it, he exteriorizes and lives for the next hundred thousand years in the area of Venus. Well, that's a new cycle, see.

So you get a cycle of lives. They don't necessarily depend on . . . The definition of cycle is imprecise. It is simply similar areas and doingnesses. Even though in Babylon he might have been a priest, he might have been a temple dancer, he may have been mayor of the town, he may have been captain of the guard, he may have been the sewer emptier, see? Because it's surrounded... And he might even have been out on the frontier or something in one lifetime, see. All kinds of different lifetimes, but somewhat united loosely by area or purpose. Loosely united. And you call that *loosely* a cycle.

But it is a sufficient change and departure from the last cycle to make its basic purpose stand independent. And this is very important to you in doing Routine 3. Because you want the basic purpose which stood before the earliest cycle you can get hold of that will register on the E-Meter. That is what you are looking for. Now, we call them goals, and they're much better expressed technically as a basic purpose.

We are looking, actually, for the beginning-of-cycle basic purposes. Now, we don't have to guide the pc in his understanding of this because you will get one basic purpose ticking – is all you're going to get anyway. Why only one? Because there is only one idea that is in disagreement with all other ideas in that mass. And that is the pc's basic purpose. And by definition it's in disagreement with all other activities, masses, items and ideas in that whole-cycle GPM. It is the odd man out, man. And it can't help but register.

Now, if you audit it, it is responsible for all the subsequent alter-ism which caused all the other masses. And you're all right because every time you list another item, you have less mass in the bank. Not because the item does anything – but because by directing the pc's attention – and the basic purpose then falls out as the thrust behind the item. You're auditing the basic purpose out and the alter-isms are what hold it in. You're not auditing out items.

Now, where does all this go in Routine 3? What happens to all these GPMs and counterbalances and items and masses and ridges and God-help-us's? What happens to them all?

If audited properly, they go *whooooo*, and they are no more with Routine 3GA. They don't go back on the track. They don't go two miles out to the left – as they did with Routine 3. They go *whooooo* because there's nothing can support them. And you can take off maybe the last three cycle GPMs off the whole GPM, the track GPM, see. The track GPM is composed of all these cycle GPMs and sometimes they have stood separate for a very long time, and then the fellow led a very forceful cycle of lives and got them all condensed in on each other. Now, he's got *the* GPM, cycle after cycle after cycle after cycle. Oddly enough a basic purpose can stand independent at the beginning of a cycle sufficient to be listed because it disinturbulates all the things which came after. But it has to be the only one, the only idea. It has to be the right idea.

Now, supposing you list some other goal. Remember, every lifetime had a goal. I've just shown you every engram has a goal at the beginning of it. How many goals do you think this pc might possibly have in just one cycle GPM twenty thousand years long? Ghastly to think of. They aren't principal ones, but if you listed them all, they'd probably amount to thousands. Actually, he covers the bulk of them in under a thousand. You'll get – all you're trying to do is get your crack at the basic purpose just before the cycle – this whole cycle of lives.

Now, if we list one of these other goals that occurs, it is in opposition to the basic goal of that cycle. And every item we list will increase the mass of that GPM. You maybe can get away with it for a hundred items on each of the four lists. Your next hundred items, your pc will start going a little bit dizzy occasionally, and if you persisted in your error, the pc would all of a sudden be sick in his stomach and the dizziness would be very acute and the pc couldn't walk in a straight line and the pains in the pc's stomach would be agonizing

And if we went another hundred, persisting along this line, and so forth, why, the pc would probably be so wogged up, that it'd take him weeks to disinturbulate. You could certainly audit him into oddball psychosomatics he'd never heard of before. You see how it'd be done? You haven't got the thing that's being alter-ised. You've got something else that's increasing the alter-ism.

The basic purpose . . . I'll give you an idea. The person had a goal to eat ice cream cones. Let's be ridiculous. Had a goal to eat ice cream cones and everybody came along and said you have to eat beef. And every time he said, "I want to eat an ice cream cone," somebody else said you had to eat beef – he'd develop a little more mass and ridges in his mind because he's doing something else. He can't as-is what's happening, you see, because he's supposed to be eating ice cream cones and he's now having to fight these people that want him to eat beef.

All right. So eventually he surrenders and becomes a beefeater. So he goes along eating beef and about this time he'll have trouble with his stomach. This we're for sure. So he decides at that time to be a doctor. Now, he finds out that he can't be a doctor because he has to have a license. See? As lifetimes roll along, there it goes. But his basic purpose was to eat ice cream cones. So now you've got the continuous alter-ness of eating ice cream cones by eating beef. And then you've got the continuous alter-ness of being a doctor which increases the mass. The more he's a doctor, the more he increases the mass of eating beef, the more he increases the mass generating around eating ice cream cones. You see? See how serious this gets.

All right, let's remove it a thousand activities up the track. At the thousandth activity, activity one thousand will, in devious zigzags, increase the mass of every other activity back down to the basic purpose or multiplies it by a thousand times. This becomes utterly intolerable, so one day he's flying a spaceship along, and he says, "There's a nice juicy sun." He gets up out of his – out of his pilot's chair and accidentally stumbles over the automatic control, jamming it irrevocably. Well, that's one way of getting rid of a GPM that is not very satisfactory. Now, but he thinks he's all over this now, and he's left it all back there on Sun 12 and so forth, and he's exteriorized and he's now being a nymph in the court at Venus. And that is entirely different. And his basic purpose is to raise hell with this place, and he can go off on another thousand lives before it catches up with him. you see that?

However, his cycles tend to get shorter, as you can see why. It gets too grim to live. The mass is too great to stand. Because it's painful. Living is painful. That's all there is to it. This is the source of pain. These accumulative masses. There are only these masses and free track in the reactive mind, that is all. And the free track, so called, is only in its mass state because it's impinged on the masses that are already there. So that is the composition of the reactive mind. There isn't anything else in the reactive mind except an alter-ness of basic purpose.

But you understand that you've got a basic purpose at the beginning of each cycle. This is theory. The rest is absolute fact, but this is theory. At the beginning of each cycle there is a basic purpose and the fellow takes off along that line. And, that we look back, we get several cycles. Twenty, thirty different cycles, and if we could get the one right at the

beginning, it would disinturbulate the whole track from there to there. Actually, you'd only have to . . . If you could get the basic one and it would register on the meter, which is to say be entirely real in its location and area to the pc, you would have to list four items, and there'd be a bright flash where the pc was sitting and there wouldn't be anything left of him but a smile.

Now, this is the touching faith of everybody in Scientology. They know there is a single button. Well, that's the single button. Difficulty with the single button is it isn't real to the pc. Won't even register. So what you're looking for is the first goal that you can reach which will stay active, that can be listed. And by listing it, you, of course, are going to run out the *subsequent* track to that goal. Subsequent track. You aren't going to get any track earlier than that. So when you got that goal flat, you're going to get the next goal that you can reach. And that will stay in. And then you can list that one and so forth. And eventually you'll get back to goal one that'll disinturbulate all the rest of it anyhow.

Well, the weird part of it is, is that one of those cycle goals, one that precedes the cycle, will list. That's what's peculiar. You're just lucky, but they will. Before I released 3GA with any velocity and so forth and wrote it up in proper bulletins and put it in the book and all this sort of thing, I wanted to be absolutely sure that I had my fingers exactly on it, and I didn't know why it worked. I didn't know exactly why it worked. So I went ahead and had to work out the rest of it. I had a lazy weekend. All I did was write a few bulletins and work that out.

Well, anyhow, the basis of a Goals Assessment then, is the discovery of – and you never mention to the pc that you want an earlier goal because these goals are all persistent and he takes them as this life or something like that – we never have to urge him, but we want the earliest goal that we can get that will register. It's got to be a prime postulate.

Now, oddly enough, the test for prime postulate is simply under the rules of assessment. You do proper assessment and a proper checkout, and if the goal stays in, then it's a prime postulate. It's the basic purpose at the beginning of some cycle. So it's safe to list. That is all you have to know. It'll drop with a single tick. If it drops with a double tick, it's just a missed withhold. It isn't a goal.

But if you follow the mechanics of assessment, you will wind up with this rather easily. Now, the mechanics of assessment follow. The Routine 3 auditor – not the Prepcheck auditor – the one who is going to do the goals listing and so on, no matter if the pc . . . Pcs very often list goals on their own and bring them into session, so we're perfectly all right.

But the first time the auditor has his paws on this pc as a Routine 3 activity, whether the pc has already listed some goals or not, we care not, we want to make sure that that auditor does a Prepcheck based on the middle rudiments. That is the first action undertaken in

a Goals Assessment. And every fifth session thereafter, a Prepcheck of the middle rudiments will occur.

You understand, you use your middle rudiments continuously just as middle rudiments, but now we're talking about a *Prepcheck* of them. And that is just a highly stylized activity. You start your session in Model Session and you use as Zero Questions the following: "On goals have you ever suggested anything?"

Ditto, had anything suggested. Ditto, suppress. Ditto, had suppressed. Ditto, invalidated. Ditto, had anything invalidated. Ditto, failed to reveal anything. Ditto, been careful of anything Ditto, told any half-truth. Ditto, told any untruth. Ditto, influenced an E-Meter. Ditto, tried not to influence an E-Meter.

I don't know why you're writing them in your notebook. It's just the – with one single addition – it's the middle ruds and the beginning of the end ruds. And that single addition is suggested because we have had auditors around who suggested things to the pc. you can get a goal stuck in by suggesting the goal to the pc and it will then consistently register thereafter. Or the auditor has suggested the goal be worded a little differently and that will stick the goal too. And you will get a read on it and it won't be the read of the goal. Do you understand that?

So you prepcheck those Zero Questions which are just your middle rudiments and the first two, three questions of the end rudiments, see? Use each one as a Zero and you just check them out and if the thing is getting a *bang-bang-bang* reaction, you just prepcheck it back. you form a What and get it back to the original and run it up, just like you do Prepchecking.

You must also prepcheck the same endings with, "On listing – ," and you must do the same Prepcheck with the listing "On items – ," ditto, see. It gives you quite a long list. You'd be amazed. And then on the word "goal." you might as also take the word "listing," and you just prepcheck it as a single word. Your Zero in that case is "goal" or "goals" or "lists" or "listing" And if you get a knock on the E-Meter, you track it down. you want these words to be clean.

You see, that's very simple, and it's on goals, on listing, your middle ruds, beginning of your end ruds. Each one of these things makes a very embracive Zero Question. That's the formula of how you work that out. It took me fifty-one minutes. I checked this out to see how well and facilely it worked the other evening just before I released the information, and it took me fifty-one minutes to get rid of the lot – on the first time it was done on this pc. And it was clean as a wolf's tooth.

So it doesn't necessarily take a session. So you've got the other part of the session. Let's say you've done – this is your fifth session on goals on the pc, so therefore you're going to have to do a Prepcheck. Maybe the first hour would be occupied with the Prepcheck and

then you'd close it out and start up your session again and your second hour would be occupied with a Goals Assessment. You understand?

It isn't necessarily true that you would have to occupy the whole of a two-hour session or a five-and-a-half-hour session or something like that. It's just in the fifth session, each fifth session you're going to do this Prepcheck. And that keeps you from working the middle rudiments to death all the time. See, that lets you pick up chain reaction on these things, because your middle ruds are always being asked, "In this session – ," you see. And it can get a little bit frantic after a few hours, so it's a good thing to go back and do . . . Well, let's pick up the whole chain and it probably goes back to childhood with some interference with lists, you know. I mean, that's right. That's right.

We found a teacher that was – knew how to teach. She told each one of her pupils to go over to the library and list all the trees there were, all the animals there were, all the birds there were. The little kids didn't have any time to play. They were just over there opening up books. They didn't know anything about the trees or the flowers, the plants or anything They were just writing down arborvorous, arborvirons. You know, trying to spell it – hour after hour after hour.

This was listing, so of course this pc was having a little bit of trouble listing And then I . . . You always find grocery lists and things like that all stacked up on the track too. Or the people wouldn't give you a list. They sent you to the store, said get some strawberries, cheese, kerosene, half a dozen limes, six eggs and some ham. That is the missingness of a list. you go down the street saying, "Half a dozen kerosenes . . ."

That's the kind of thing you want off here. you want it – and you won't get them off, of course, just asking middle ruds, because your middle ruds have no track. They have just the session. They don't even have the track of the auditing sessions you've been running. They only have the track of this session. So that's your middle rud. Now, the reason you get that out is that you won't have any – anything much getting in your road and your needle going wild on that sort of thing.

Now, of course, in checking out one, you do this Prepcheck before you check out the goal. I don't care if you just did it last session. You found the goal now and you got it there. Well, let's do a Prepcheck and then let's check out the goal.

Now, one of the reasons you keep doing this and you keep prepchecking these middle rud Zeros is because the pc keeps changing under a Goals Assessment. Not as much as under listing, but they change. New incidents come up, new ideas, that sort of thing.

All right. Your first action then of a Goals Assessment is to prepcheck the middle ruds as Zeros. Your next action is to start listing, in Model Session, keeping your rudiments in with your sensitivity set for a one-dial drop, with some kind of an eye on the tone arm so that you

can whiz along and you all of a sudden see that the needle's motionless, the tone arm's motionless, and there's nothing much happening, and well, your rudiments are out.

Now, I don't particularly tell you that you should read anything extraordinary, marvelous or wonderful from your meter while you are listing. Tone arm action is relatively unimportant and so forth. But you need that meter there tuned up and in function because you will get accustomed to taking some information from the meter even as you list.

Now, the second that you get the pc slowed down, doped off or a bit out of session, having a hard time listing goals, having a hard time thinking of more goals, you get in the middle rudiments. And of course your middle rudiments contain just suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal and been careful of.

There is an additional middle rudiment that might apply to specialized pcs and you might like to use it. And the pc is actually suppressing suggestions and sometimes the pc doesn't rate it under the head of suppression. And it comes under "failed to suggest." "Did you fail to suggest something?" The pc's sitting there madly out of session because they wanted to suggest that you do something, but they know that they're not supposed to and that you won't take it up anyhow, and all kinds of complications and so on. If you run into that kind of a situation, why, you can run "failed to suggest" into your middle rudiments. I'm not necessarily leaving it in there because I found out that it quite often comes up under the heading of suppressions. And you'll get a reaction on the thing if it's seriously out.

The middle ruds are never intended to be clean from a standpoint of the whole track. Rudiments are never intended to be clean from the standpoint of the whole track. Nothing is lasting about rudiments, you understand? Even when you prepcheck rudiments, don't expect it to be lasting. So just because you've gotten the rudiments in on listing five minutes before is no reason they're not now out.

Now, one of the things that you're sloppiest about is getting in – getting the rudiments in without knocking the pc out of session. You've got to get in, get your rudiments out – get in, get your rudiments in and then get back into session rapidly so that you don't make this thing a lifetime profession with tremendous weight on it so they're way out of session worrying about their rudiments. They're way, way out of session worrying about their rudiments when they should be thinking about their goals. You understand?

Giving middle rudiments the wrong weight, getting things very, very upset is one of the worst crimes that you can do under listing. Your rudiments can be used to throw the pc out of session as easily as to throw them in. But expert use of the rudiments and a refusal to Q-and-A with the pc, getting in, getting them in, getting them out again, leaving them clean every time, and so forth, is marvelous assistance on listing.

Now, your main idea in listing is to get something on the order of 850 goals listed before you do another thing Eight hundred and fifty listed before you do another thing. Why? Very well the goal may be in the first 150 and most often is, but insufficient charge is off of the bank for you to isolate that goal easily. Insufficient charge.

The goals are so heavily charged up that you are not going to be able to separate one goal from another. You're going to come off with the goals remaining in very hard, going over it with many nullings, worrying, worrying, worrying, worrying, worrying, and it worries an auditor silly. You're not going to do 850 because the goal is not on the list until you've written the 850th goal, see. You're going to do it to discharge the goals list of charge, so that you can then find the goal.

You will very often find that it – the goal did appear in the first 150 goals listed. But don't worry the pc about this because the pc doesn't know it anyhow. The one thing the pc doesn't know is his own goal.

The pc who comes up and tells you that this is his goal and that is that and who tries to do a big sales talk even, you know, one pc out of five will monkey the meter. Did you know that? Oh, it's that prevalent. You know, shift the eyeball with the havingness down, you know. Start to sell the auditor the goal. Sometimes they sell it to the degree of lifting a little finger off of the can. Fact. They want to have that goal. They know what goal they should have. They know better than the auditor or the E-Meter, and they get a wrong goal every time they do it.

Well, the goal is what the goal is. Not what the pc wants it to be and not what the auditor hopes it will be. The auditor can interject his hope on the thing to such a degree that he'll weight the session. And by suggestion, get the goal to continue to tick. And then if his middle ruds are badly cleaned up – see, the middle ruds'll get the tick off if it's ticking because of any other reason than it's the goal; don't worry about that. This goal can actually sit there and tick and respond every single time because the auditor suggested it to the pc.

So you come along and you find some pc who has – some auditor, and he had the goal “To shoot pigeons.” And you'll find out that he tends to find on the pc the goal “To shoot woodcocks.” That is very fascinating. How does he make it? He weights it. He actually can *suggest* to the pc one way or the other. It has to be quite overt. It's not esoteric at all. “Well, heh! Let's – let's – let's go in for this goal now. This – this – this one. Ha! This goal here. Ha! Ya! Ha! Yeah, we haven't been getting much excitement here. I'm glad we're to this goal now because I want to really check *this one out*: 'To – ' now, are you listening, huh?”

We've been running along at this rate, see, “To catch catfish, to run over poodles,” so forth, you see. We get all of a sudden this burst of enthusiasm, you see. And then we get: “All right. *To shoot woodcocks.*” For some reason or other the goal will continue to read. Why? Well, it's just weighted to such a degree that it's gone over the borderline to a suggestion.

The auditor then, by being *sure* of what the pc's goal is, can actually weight the goal for the pc. And have done it. I've seen some of them checked out. Five goals found by one auditor. They were all alike on five different pcs. Quite similar. It isn't anybody present.

I got a hurry-up despatch not so long ago that – auditor told me they finally found this pc's goal. They knew that everybody else had it wrong. Isn't it interesting there was only one word difference between the pc's goal and that auditor's goal. Well, I assure you of something – they're never that close together. Man in his infinite variety doesn't have standard goals because in the first place you're picking up beginning of cycle goals, and God knows what they'll be. What infinite variety occur in these things. And they're with their own wording and they're on their own subjects and so forth.

There is on the eighth dynamic a little more coincidence of goals than on any other dynamic. You'll find that God will come in more often. You know, if you've got – in any hundred cases you'll probably find all of them are different except maybe five, six, eight, something like this, will all have a goal that has something to do with gods or God, or something. It's the most incidence, and that's because there's the least subject matter in this civilization at this time on the subject of the eighth dynamic. We're still using Akhenaton's invisible big-thetan theory. And there's one God, don't you see? And you can't see him and it's only peculiar to this time and place, see. If you were doing this in pagan Rome, you wouldn't get that much coincidence. It's just for the lack of objects on the eighth dynamic. There is – somebody's stuck on the eighth dynamic, you see, they tend to get the same object person after person.

All right. Your first action is the Prepcheck. Your next action is the listing. When the slowdown occurs on the listing, you get your middle rudiments in without making the case go z-z-z-z-z. You get them in smoothly, quickly and get out of there with no Q and A. No heavy weight. Get back on to your listing and go 850 before you null anything. I don't care if you go 1,000, but just don't stop south of 850. Much easier on the pc in the long run.

Now, it's true that very often you would be able to get away with it at 500. See? But you'd be getting away with something at 500 and you might wind up in a ball. The pc hasn't listed enough goals to get enough charge off the goals that you get easy nulling so you waste *all* of the time on nulling that you thought you saved on goals listing. And you even waste more time. In addition to that, if the goal isn't yet distinct, if charge enough isn't off of the case, then you're going to get this oddity. You're going to list the 500 and not have a goal for the pc. So you're going to list another hundred and not have a goal for the pc. And then you're going to list another hundred and not have a goal for the pc. Three loses in a row. Now, how do you think you're going to keep the middle rudiments in easily, huh? All right. Let's give him 4, 5, 6, you see, because now his rudiments are so far out that you can now start missing

it. In other words, you're making it difficult. This is a difficult Goals Assessment to go by fits and starts. Some of you've got reality on that.

So just start right on out and list 850 and when you've got 850 or thereabouts, why, then bleed your meter down. "Are there any more goals?" "What about goals?" something like this. And "Are there any goals that should be on this list?" You get a reaction. Well, get some more.

Now, do a Prepcheck. Remember that you can get a reaction because the pc is ARC broke. You kept asking him for more goals and he didn't have more goals. And you didn't have your – you know and the pc couldn't tell you this. So the fact that there aren't no more come – becomes a missed withhold with the pc and you get fantastic needle reaction on goals, on asking for more goals, when in actual fact the pc is simply ARC broken. The thing you want to do is ask the pc if he has an ARC break and if you get a reaction, clean it up and then ask if he has any more goals, and you'll find out he doesn't have.

All that comes under the heading of simply keeping your rudiments in.

All right. In other words, you bleed down the situation. You bleed down the meter on the list. you try to get all the goals that the meter is calling for. Now, you start in at the top and you null and this is the way in which you null. you null, of course, with your rudiments in and you should be getting needle reaction on goals as you null. If you're getting no needle reaction of any kind, your pc is out of session. Your rudiments are out.

But if you're getting the occasional tick and tock as you go along, your rudiments aren't out. So it's at... If you suddenly notice that you're not getting any ticks or tocks or anything of the sort as you go along, well, your rudiments are out and you better get your rudiments in in a hurry. You see what makes it . . . Actually you can tell if the rudiments are out by whether or not the goals you read one after the other are each one reading because they'll all read to some degree. They got some action on the needle. You can tell a live needle and a dead one.

All right. Now, this is the way you call a goal out. you read the goal three times. You "okay" the pc after every time you read it. "To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you. That's out."

There is your most favorable patter. The pc hasn't said a word now, you know. The pc is just sitting there in a glorious state of irresponsibility about this.

Now, if the goal is null on the last two reads, you take it out. And if either one of the last two reads are live, you leave it in. The symbol to take it out is an X. The symbol to leave it in is a slant. You put an additional slant or an X every time you read a goal. In other words, it's cumulative. If you've read this goal five times, you will have five slants after it. If you read it five times, and then on the sixth read it went out, it'll be five slants and one X.

All right. Now, “To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you. To catch catfish. Thank you. That is out.”

Now, that first nulling, the whole nulling of the whole list is done at a one-dial drop on the cans, please. One-dial drop.

When you put your rudiments in, you have to get over there and shift your sensitivity up to 16, of course. Rudiments are always put in at 16. And then they're cut back to the one-dial drop setting before you go on nulling. And don't make a mistake on that because you make a fool out of yourself. All of a sudden, everything is in. Everything is in, you see. And you don't want that.

All right. If the last two reads of that three, either one of the last two read, you leave it in. But if the last two are null, you take it out. That is at a one-dial drop. And that is how you call them in or out. Relatively simple.

All right. Now, you go over this list. If you've listed 850, by the way, you may only find one goal per column staying in. Very slight. But you'll be getting – that first one will tick. You'll see some reaction on the first one and then no action on the next two on almost every goal. There are very few of those goals will be completely flat on the first mention.

All right. Now, having read this list through to a point where you have 30 or 40 in, I don't know how many times you'll have to go over it to only have 30 or 40 in, maybe over the whole list twice, something like that. But you've got 30 or 40 left in. you reduce the list to that many left in.

Copy those goals onto a separate sheet of paper. Mark it a copied list. Be very careful that your middle rudiments are very beautifully in and crank your sensitivity up to 16 and don't leave one of those goals with any charge on it at all. There must be no charge on any part of that final list at sensitivity 16, when you finally announce “I have the goal.”

In other words, the fifth one down from the top on that final list: that's got charge on it and the eighth one's got a little tick on it and the tenth one's got a tick on it and the twelfth one is reading like mad and you say, “All right. That twelfth one is it.” No, that twelfth one isn't it because you have not checked it out. you couldn't have checked it out because there are two or three other goals on that list that had ticks left in them.

So after you have gotten it all ground down to a fine powder and there's only one goal on that final list ticking, you say, “All right. This looks like it. We're going to check it out.”

And now you do a nice, complete Prepcheck. Polish it all up beautifully, do a nice, complete Prepcheck. Get the pc's havingness in good shape. Shouldn't take you long to do either one of those things. Roll up your sleeves and read that goal against every other goal on the 30 to 40 list. Something like playing a game with a knife whereby you – you've always got

to touch this X and touch a number of other X's at the same time and your knife touches the random mark and then it always touches the single X. Your goal is the single X, so you say – let's say the goal was: “To catch catfish.” It's “To catch catfish. To shoot opera singers. To catch catfish. To drown pleasantly. To catch catfish. To join the navy. To catch catfish. To commit suicide,” see?

And every one of those random ones must be flat and that last centerpin goal must be ticking every time for you to say, “I have a goal on the pc.” Then you say, “I have a goal on the pc.”

Now, cleaning up this goal with the middle ruds – it is understood that after you've prepchecked all the stuff in general, you're going to have middle ruds running Well, your middle rudiments will run against this goal. I must mark this. Middle ruds could be run against lists, goals, a goal. “Has the goal 'to catch catfish' been invalidated?” See? Any one of your middle ruds. you ask them all. “Is there anything about the goal 'to catch catfish' that you have failed to reveal?” “What's that? That. That. That. That. That. That. That. That. That. That. That. That.”

The very funny part of it is that your goal can stay in because the middle ruds are out and can be out because the middle ruds are out. you pays your money and you takes your chance. But if the middle ruds are completely flat on that goal and it reads, that is the goal.

Now, it should read every time tick, tick, tick, “To catch catfish. Tick. To catch catfish. Tick. To catch catfish. Tick. To catch cat .” See? But you may have a pc who breathes or something and you'll get a sudden upswing of the needle, which is too fast or too violent for the impulse to check. And your eye does not detect the infinitesimal slowdown of the upward throw. So as the needle is flying around, you say, “To catch catfish. To catch catfish.” Those are in, see. “To catch catfish.” And that one, there was a . . . You said that on a violent upward swing of the needle. The pc would say hrrrrr or something, you know. And a needle has weight and its inertial swing, as it's coming up with great rapidity or going down with great rapidity, can sometimes overcome the motion of a goal. So that would be the exception – the exception. Your needle would have to be moving quite speedily before you would get that exception, and actually if your eye was very sharp, you'd even tick – you'd even detect the tick in the middle of it even that time.

Now, that is a goal. That is a goal listed, found and checked out. There is actually no more to a Goals Assessment than that. And there isn't actually anything else to a Goals Assessment than that. Nothing mysterious about it, because that makes a very easy assessment. That's carefully plotted to get you around an innumerable complexity of troubles that have existed in the past.

That it appears to be very simple is quite deceptive. Don't think of it as being terribly simple, so therefore it doesn't much matter what we do with it. We can make it a little more complicated, can't we?

For instance, let's ask for the goal in peculiar ways. How do you ask for a goal? Well, you just simply say, "Well, what goal have you had? Have you ever had a goal?" I don't care what. The only categories that you ask for particularly – you could ask for middle rud categories of goals. Goals that you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of. Now, there's – you could use your middle ruds to get you more goals. Under failed to reveal, of course, you could get such a subdivisional heading as secret goals, antisocial goals, goals you withheld from other people. So you could make various classifications, but don't go beyond that in terms of classifying goals.

You got your middle ruds and you could discuss those angles, but just ask for goals. Don't ask for a list of goals you shouldn't have had, see. Don't ask for a lot of offbeat type of things because you'll wind up with some other part of the track, see. You'll wind up with oppgoals. And God's sakes, don't get an oppgoal on the list.

Now, put anything on the list the pc wants on the list. put it on the list as many times as the pc says it, in as many different ways as the pc says it. We don't care if he puts the goal down fifty times, "To catch catfish," and it turns out to be the wrong goal after all. We don't do any guidance on what he can have on the list or not on the list and we never advise him to reword something. We never try to build a goal out of the numerous parts of goals we have seen come in. Nothing tricky. We just write it down and that's the way it is from there on out.

Now, if the pc wants to add goals, we will add goals to the list at any time. We'll always add goals to the list. But if a pc wants to change the goal, we leave the goal in and we put the new wording down. We never eradicate a goal just because the pc wants to change his wording we just put the new wording down. Get the idea?

When you get the second goal, you follow almost exactly the same procedure except the numerousness of the original list is not required. You don't have to list that many. You've already got 850 you're going to have to null all over again.

Okay. That is how you do a Goals Assessment. Fairly simple, huh? There will be bulletins and other materials out on it, but I have given you this lecture so that you would actually have it well in advance of its publication because you're using this material all the time and therefore need it. Okay?

Thank you.