

LISTING

A lecture given on
14 June 1962

Okay. This is a short lecture about listing. This is lecture two, 14 June AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Listing: Listing is an activity which is engaged upon after one has found a goal. I gave you a talk the other evening about how to find a goal. Well, the way you list a goal is relatively simple. If the goal is in – it stays in after being duly checked – you begin listing.

Now, you may run into some problems of listing. And the first problems you run into is: the goal has been found, the goal has been checked out, the goal is – that's fine – and the first thing you run into are the first invalidations the pc is being careful not to make with his new-found possession. So the first action of listing is a Prepcheck.

Now, you see, we – this has nothing to do with checking out goals or anything like that. Only let's emphasize lists and listing all over again. This person has had a lot of Prepchecks on this subject, but he now has a – new expansive opportunities to invalidate.

Now, this goal that he's got there is going to do peculiar things in the next few sessions. It's going to read and not read and it's going to do this and it's going to do that; because its reads are going to go over on to lists, and these reads are going to go onto items, and it's going to flick back and forth. And it'd be funny if it didn't, because you are using the most powerful method of getting rid of an aberrated prime postulate that has been devised: 3GA. So, of course, it's going to *do* something to the goal.

So the first thing we must *know* about listing is that when we *start* listing, we Prepcheck and make very sure that the goal is there to be listed. That's for sure – because that's the last, pure, clean opportunity we're going to have to nail it down.

Now, we make this as a specification for this particular reason: goals have often been found by other auditors and checked out by other auditors. But remember, if you are a listing auditor who did not find the goal, your responsibility for listing is tremendously great. So, you should start it with a Prepcheck.

Now, if the goal is partially listed and been partially listed, you're kind of around the bend. Now you're not so sure about this whole thing. And I know of no other way to go about it than to check the line wordings for a read. If the goal doesn't read, perhaps the line wordings will read. If a line wording reads, of course the goal is valid.

Now, this means then, that your Prepcheck – if you’re taking over a case that’s had a partially listed goal – your Prepcheck must include “discussion of items.” You’re going to ask about goals and you’re going to ask about listing, and you must also ask about items, specific items and auditing sessions for items. Why? Because you could get a line ticking merely because it was ARC broke. See?

Now, these line wordings are just as vital as the goal itself, so don’t skimp them. And they’re going to offer you some very tricky problems.

The usual and ordinary goal is something like “to catch catfish.” All right, that’s fine. That’s a perfectly ordinary goal. That lists – you can form up the wording very easily because you simply add “want,” “not want,” “oppose,” “not oppose,” before the goal, and then before each one of those, “Who or what would ?”

See, the formula is very simple – nothing to this, “Who or what would want to catch catfish?” “Who or what would not want to catch catfish?” “Who or what would oppose catching catfish?” “Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?” So those are perfectly valid lines in most cases.

But you have changed the goal, haven’t you? “To catch catfish” has been changed to “catching catfish.” So there’s one little alteration there that you should be rather careful of. Usually you will get away with it. This is quite valid and everything is fine. But if there’s any question in your mind, you had better put “the goal” in front of the goal itself. “Who or what would want the goal to catch catfish?” “Who or what would not want the goal to catch catfish?” “Who or what would oppose the goal to catch catfish?” “Who or what would not oppose the goal to catch catfish?”

Now, that is not a perfect alternate, but it might be all right. Not perfect, but it might be all right. You must realize that there is no perfect wording You’ve got to have, however, “want to,” “not want to,” “oppose” and “not oppose” as the subject and character of your lines.

But goals vary, and for that reason – and pcs’ reaction to goals vary – semantics gets in the road of it. Now, any way that you can get the actual goal – as originally worded – expressed, is the best way to word it. That is the best way to word it.

Now, I can give you an alternate wording, but – of various kinds – but *no* wording would fail to have in it “want,” “not want,” “oppose” and “not oppose.” Those are the four lines. They are not necessarily in that order while you list them, but those are certainly the proper ways. And each one is preceded by “Who or what would ?” Not “could” or “can” or anything but “would.” “Who or what would ?” Always “Who or what would ?”

And now we get into interesting things. I have not seen many negative goals prove out, but negative goals can exist – not to invalidate negative goals. And it’s very, very remarkable

that a negative goal does not lend itself to good listing at all – wording – doesn't lend itself to good wording

Let's take the goal "not to be detected." That's the goal, "not to be detected." Not even "to not to be," see? It's "not to be detected."

"That's my goal, 'not to be detected.' That's it!" It's not "to not to be detected." See, just "not to be detected." What the hell are you going to do with this?

Well, it depends on your meter. Your problem is to get "want," "not want," "oppose" and "not oppose" in front of that goal and "Who or what would ?" in front of each one of those in some fashion that (underscore) registers on the meter like the goal. It's got to register; got to make sense to the pc. So there's two tests there that you can immediately resort to.

Now if you word it wrong, you're going to get a cow's dinner. You're going to have three lines worded right and one line at right angles to the Federal Church, Incorporated and has nothing whatsoever to do with the case. There's going to be one line missing.

Now, that the pc can or cannot list on a line is actually no test. That's not a test, because the line "not oppose" is always something on the order of reaching into the wild blue nowhere, because it has never offered any resistance. It is the bull and the cape. See, nothing solid to push against – every time he lunges at the cape there's nothing there. So you say to the pc, "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" And the pc goes . . . Nothing there, you know? Makes him feel bad. Dandy. It's nothing wrong with that. So he feels bad, but that's no test. So he feels bad, but if you were running that and the pc was telling you he has a *lot* of trouble with it – most pcs will tell you they have a *lot* of trouble with it. Believe me, it's a vital line, because it's one of the four flows.

Well, let's suppose you worded it up in some fashion, "Who or what would not oppose catfish?" See? You make a horrible error like that, see? Everything else was "catching catfish" or "to catch catfish." But this last one – this last one was "would not oppose catfish." Well, he's going to have – very interesting – very interesting list! No doubt, it's going to be a fine list, but that needle is never going to go free. It's going to park the case, you see? A mess.

Now, the negative goal offers you the problem of the double negative. "Who or what would not oppose not being detected?" Isn't that horrible? So the word *the goal* – by the way – by the way, don't say that that's impossible not to use the double negative, because for some reason or other a pc has already listed well on a double negative and wouldn't have it any other way – and just listed fine. But we can't count on all pcs doing this that well, so we get *the goal* interposed in there as a method of separating out the double negative. "Who or what would not oppose the goal not to be detected?"

Now, when you're doing that a question enters into it on the first line: "Who or what would want the goal not to be detected?" Doesn't work, does it?

Audience: Mm-mm. Mm.

Well, it's a mess. Now, you'd better reach into the truth of the situation, because that first line is basically concerned with an item which does have this goal. So in that particular case you can test the line, "Who or what would have the goal not to be detected?" So we drop out "want" and we'd substitute "have." But notice all the rest of them fall into line quite well, but that one changes. Do you see that?

You've got to get four flows that operate against this line – now this particular goal – four flows that operate around and with and in this goal.

Now what do those flows consist of? The goal is a prime postulate which has accumulated on to itself a number of identities by which the purpose could be executed. It has assumed these identities because there were a bunch of people that didn't want the goal and those were stupid and incomprehensible, so one had to prove it to them that the goal was okay.

And there were a bunch of more people who violently and desperately opposed this goal and there were a bunch more people who didn't oppose it, and nevertheless, were in some peculiar way associated with it.

Now, if you can't express those flows on your four listings directly and immediately surrounding this prime postulate, of course the thing is not going to go clean. This thing is going to mess itself up one way or the other. Now, to change wording in midflight can be quite upsetting to the pc. So after you've prepchecked and fixed up the goal, and it registers and it reads and it bangs like mad, and everything is fine, and any little dabs at listing or monkeying with it or invalidation – these things are all knocked out and they're all cleaned up beautifully – you make sure of that wording And that wording should register.

Now, after you've gone into the wording – make sure that you go into it well enough and thoroughly enough with discussion with the pc and that sort of thing – that this wording actually works out to be *the* wording for the four flows for that goal. Because after that, to change it is going to be upsetting

Now, this doesn't say that you will never change the line – the wording of a listing, because you'll pull a bloomer sometime or another on something and you'll suddenly find out this line never has listed, you know? Nothing – no item on the line has anything to do with anything you've been doing, and something like that. That would be almost catastrophic, however.

Try desperately to hold to your original solution, having established it. So establish it with care and then hold to it unless the spot is absolutely untenable. If every time you say to the pc, "Who or what would not be a catfish?" or whatever the goal is, he says, "I – I can't answer it," see? And you get the middle rudiments in beautifully, polish it all off, and he still

can't answer it – you're faced with some kind of a super emergency of this particular character. In other words, your wording was wrong in the first place and now it has moved into full view and the moon shines piteously down upon it all, and your crime lies stark upon the moor.

Well, the thing to do is be right before you start. It isn't saying you can't recover from it, but it'd be upsetting if you had to – pc now feels all confused.

Now, in listing, you probably will list against a low-sensitivity-set tone arm. In other words, you just turn the thing on barely and keep your needle more or less at set so as to get your relative tone arm read and position. Now, you get your relative action without having to madly shift the tone arm all the time to keep your needle on the dial. In other words, it can be neglected for periods while you're busy writing and the fur flying in all directions.

Now, every fifth session you're going to prepcheck the whole subject of goals, listing, auditing and so forth, newly, just as you did in a Goals Assessment. And you're going to run the middle ruds, regardless of how often you prepcheck them, every time you stop running a list – regardless of whether it needs it or not. You're going to get the middle rudiments in every time you stop listing on a list.

Now, you'll find that there's a periodic order of frequency of action for each list, which diminishes. (Boy, didn't that sound complicated? 'Tisn't. I'll say it in English.) It decreases: The length of time a list is active for one listing before you leave it to the next becomes progressively shorter. You'll get good action on the TA on a list, and then the action will slow and become less impressive. Get your middle rudiments in, go to your next list and list that, and you'll find out you've got your TA action back again, and then that will diminish. So you're always running to diminish TA action.

Now, I couldn't tell you, because we can't hazard a guess, where this prime postulate is going to sit on the pc's track. What GPM – what track, or rather what cycle GPM is this thing preceding Well, we don't know that. So we don't know how much bank we're relieving and so forth.

But ordinarily, I'd say a half hour of listing on a list seems overly long, but you probably, you probably at the beginning, on a very mucked-up pc would only be able to list – if you're going to list all the TA action out, see, all the TA action is going to come out and so on – you'd probably find it a session – I just want to give you an example – a session per list. See, you'd list – list one for a session, list two for a session, list three for a session, list four for a session. You understand?

I'm not recommending that. Don't put that down as recommended. I'm just giving you how long that list would remain active before the TA action went out of it. It is, however, very unbalancing and impractical to do anything like this. It's impractical.

So, you just do – better do it by the count at first or by the minutes or any other way. But if you stop a pc in the middle of an automaticity, he gets a suppression. So, allow – allowing for automaticities, you more or less list an arbitrary number for each list, making perhaps fifteen minutes a list early on – something of this sort. you list maybe fifteen minutes on each list: list fifteen minutes, get your middle rudiments in; list your next list fifteen minutes, get your middle rudiments in; list your next list fifteen minutes, get your middle rudiments in; list your next list fifteen minutes and get your middle rudiments in; go back to your first list and list it. Now, of course, none of those lists were exhausted, so your TA action there is deceptively high.

Now, if a pc gets into an automaticity, for heaven's sakes don't stop him in his tracks – please. Please don't stop him in his tracks, because he'll do a suppress. So if a pc is listing rapidly and freely, let him go on listing, but that doesn't mean four sessions. You understand? Doesn't even mean one session, because none of these automaticities will run more than maybe 135, 150, 175 items. That's an awful lot. And that's an extreme automaticity. But they'll just start firing off, you know? “Waterbuck, tiger, clock, policeman,” you know? And you're having a hell of a time keeping up with him.

Now, on listing it is very, very bad form to do either one of two things: to tell the pc to wait while you write the thing down and to fail to write it down. Either one of those things is a crime. You pays your money and you takes your chance!

However, the pc will comm lag in the ordinary course of human existence, adequately as he runs along on a list line to give you lags, at which moment you can catch up. Of course, if you got into a 135-item automaticity that was firing off like a machine gun, you've practically had it. Now, how you handle that, I don't know. As far as a solution to the thing is concerned, it's *wrong* to stop the pc and it's *wrong* to miss the items. Well, you say, “Well, I guess I'll just have to write faster.” Yeah, that's a good answer; that's a good answer.

Another thing you could do, of course, is set a tape recorder going back of you – not advised. You won't find that you have too much trouble with this, but there is some little problem comes up in connection with it.

Now, when you're so busy writing, how do you ever find time to keep your auditor's report? That's difficult too. But actually, pcs can be encouraged to comm lag You say, “Well, you think there's any more on that particular list, now? ‘Who or what would not want to catch catfish?’” You already knew he'd run out, see? That's not advised either, but I'm afraid I would subterfuge to it in more agonized moments of auditing.

Now, your setup on listing is that your lists must be kept of parity length. Try to keep them somewhere on the equal number of pages. Don't let one list run madly ahead of others. And you will see this tendency before you have been listing on four lists very long You will all of a sudden look over at list three: “Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?”

Ahumpf. It has twenty items on it and everything else has two hundred. Now you're up against the horrors of trying to catch that list up. Now, how do you do it? Well, you don't encourage any additional on any of the other lists, that's all. You list some on "Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?" You list quite a few, see? You list as many as you can possibly get listed and then you list briefly the other three lists, just almost as many as are volunteered. You just say the name of the list and the fellow gives you one item. And you say, "Fine," and you say the name of the list and he gives you one item – that's the next list – and you say the name of the next list, and he gives you one item. And then, you of course have gotten your middle rudiments in very carefully when you left this other list. Do you see? Well, get them in again very carefully, you know, and then list eighty on it. you can bring a list back to balance. But really it's quite wrong to get the list far out of balance.

Now, in the first part of listing you list more or less arbitrarily, in other words. You list arbitrarily as in terms of time. you keep an arbitrary number increasing That is to say, you – you're listing maybe twenty per each, and so forth, because it's not important early on. It's such a mass anyhow, that it doesn't make much difference as long as they all get listed. And then as long as there's some equality in the lengths of the lists, you're not going to get lost as you go along the line.

But later on there's another factor enters into listing As you come on down the homestretch, you will find that you are up against the terrible thing called a free needle. Now, let me point out to you that it is an Auditor's Code break to list a line on which a free needle has appeared. Why is it a Code break? Because then you're running a process that is not producing change. See that?

So you come on down the line and you've listed six, eight – something like that – and all of a sudden the needle is floating and free. Well, don't sit there admiring it. A stage four needle can be mistaken, by the way, for a free, floating needle, but only by a very amateur amateur. Stage four is a repetitive sweep up and a stick and a fall, and so forth. Well, the free floating needle just drifts. It's a beautiful thing to see. you never make the mistake of reading one after you've seen one once – that is a free needle.

Well, when you list down to a free needle, you're now going to upset the interesting pattern of your way, because you're only now going to list the next line that produces a needle reaction. So you list down to a free needle and then you read the next line to the pc with the forecast of "This is a test," see? And if that free needle isn't upset – that is to say, if it doesn't stick or bop or do something – you don't list that line. you skip that line. you go on to the next line after that and test it. If it remained free, you go on to the next line and you test it and if it remained free, you go on to the first one and test it; and if it remained free and you couldn't get any of the four lines to react at all, you better find a new goal because that one is dead.

But toward the end of listing you will discover that you had better list by test – you better list by test. In other words, line one all of a sudden has taken it into its head to float free and line two doesn't upset it, but line three does, so you'd better list line three to free needle. But if it doesn't go to free needle after a little while, you figure you're running on too far and too fast, you'd better go to line four. Do you see? What you're trying to achieve, there, is listing by test. You're only going to list against the needle in other words. If you don't get a needle reaction when you read the line "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" then you don't list it.

You'll find this way, at the end of the case, you catch up all the inequalities of lines. When those inequalities are all caught up... By the way, they're not numerical inequalities, they'll just be charge inequalities. Don't you see? Your lines now at the end, by doing this, might get quite uneven. They won't become double the length or anything like that, but they will become uneven just because you're listing against needle reaction.

Now, I must caution you against the sins of overlisting. The sin of overlisting is of course an Auditor's Code break. The needle is free and it isn't upset by a line and it isn't upset by further items – you're, of course, listing a flat process. It is like running a process that no longer produces change on the case and it'll *upset* the pc.

But that isn't why you mustn't overlist. You can fix up an upset; I'm sure you can keep in rudiments now, thank God. But your goal that you're operating with on this pc is not the prime postulate of his entrance into this universe. It is only the beginning of some cycle or another that you have laid your paws on through a Goals Assessment. And it might be no more ancient than a few centuries – might be that close to PT. Now look, this thing has some dim harmonic against some other goal earlier or something, because there's earlier material that can be pulled up. And you get too enthusiastic and you start yanking in earlier track, because you're pressing the pc to give you items, and the pc obligingly starts picking up the wrong GPM.

So you list *just* to free needle. You don't list *beyond* free needle on each one of the lists.

My, you know, I'll tell you this on the side, it's a great relief to be able to talk to you about what you do with a free needle.

So anyway, it's a little merry-go-round and you keep going around: one, two, three, four; one, two, three, four; one, two, three, four – like a well-ordered engine. And it batters down the gates of Jericho like a bang so there's nothing much to handling it, providing you are listing the right lines and you kept your rudiments in when you did so.

Now, toward the end, you will find that getting the middle rudiments in every time you list one item gets to be just a little bit of a strain, and more tends to throw the pc out of session than in. So I would only get them in as I went around each time there was a beefy line listing

going on or you did fifteen items or you did ten items or you did something like that. Now get the middle rudiments in. And now you've got two and that only took one or two items each, and then the third one, it took ten items. Well, get your middle rudiments in against the ten. Do you see? And you'll find out you'll make more progress. Otherwise than that, early on in listing, you run it every time you have finished a list – see, every time you've stopped listing on this.

Now, the reason a pc stops listing is because the pc has some middle rudiment out – just mark that up. That is the *only* reason a pc stops listing, whether he's listing a goal or he's listing any kind of a line proceeding from a goal – only one reason, is the middle rudiments are out.

A pc, however, can accumulate sufficient residual charge on the subject between sessions, and so on, that the middle rudiments have to be prepchecked to get it all swept in. So you could perhaps find that the fourth session after your Prepcheck – your last Prepcheck of the middle ruds – ran more arduously than the one that ran immediately after the Prepcheck session.

But listing stops, and – take it from me, it's absolutely true – it only stops when the middle rudiments are out. It does not stop because the pc is out of items. It doesn't stop for any other reason. You could probably *force* a pc with middle rudiments to list a thousand items on a single one of these lines. The fantastic imbalance which this would cause in a bank would be absolutely frightful. But you could use middle rudiments to make him list quite happily on all thousand before you touched the other three. If you did such a thing, you ought to be shot, but I'm just showing you the extent of the middle rudiments in assisting listing.

Never get the idea that the pc has run out of items. Never get the idea that this is a “Oh well, naturally, he can't think of any more,” and so forth. This is not true. He hasn't thought of a single one since you started auditing him. He hasn't! He hasn't thought of a single item. Pcs *don't* think of items – they deal them off the bank. If he had no more items to deal off, he would have no GPM! So obviously, he stops listing only when the middle rudiments have gone out and he, therefore, can't get into communication. Do you see?

Now, what do you do after you have brought one goal and four lists down to a free needle on each list? That is the end of your first stage. In earlier days you would have called this a Clear and gone around and patted everybody on the back. Well, we'll still call it a Clear, why not? Because we have – we can say a stable Clear; we can say a Theta Clear; we can say other states of case, don't you see? That guy is sure Clear. You can clear up his needle almost any time by cleaning up the middle ruds on the goal or something, see, or on lines or on life or something. You can always get your free needle back. He wakes up in the morning; he finds out that he's at 3.24 constantly or do a little Prepcheck, and you can get that out of the road,

and he'll happily wake up every morning dead-on at 3.0. Do a fish and fumble for fifteen minutes – you could probably accomplish that, you see? Ten minutes, eight minutes.

So your listing is auditing and is done as the sole operation of auditing

Now, you want to watch your acknowledgment in listing. This is another little tip. The fellow says, "A grizzly bear, a lion, a wolf, a – something-other, so on." Well, now, of course, the fact you're writing these things down is an acknowledgment all by itself. That's quite an acknowledgment. But you keep up a little humming song of "Mm-hm," and let me tell you, you will be a lot, lot better off than: He says, "A lion," you say, "Thank you!"

Well, that's the end of that, man. The guy – sits back and – what happened? You're not now going to get the next two items until you get the middle rudiments in. It's operated as an invalidation; you ended cycle. Of course, end of cycle is the end of the list. So listing is sort of on the basis of he says, "A lion, a catfish, a grizzly bear, a wolf." And the auditor each time is saying – or as often as he gets around to it – saying, "Mm-hm. Any more? All right." Saying, "Mm-hm. Got that. All right. Thank you," and so on. He's just going on.

Now, an auditor doing listing very often feels so much like a secretary obeying the boss that they lose control of the session. I've noticed this as a phenomenon. They get so willing to be inflowed on that they don't control the session and that is the first great auditing error in listing. You just keep writing and you never do anything else and the next darn thing you know the pc is out from under, all the rudiments are out – not just the middle rudiments – and, you've got hell to pay. So, when you've stopped listing you give him a good acknowledgment – not to blow him out of the chair or something like that – but, you give him a good acknowledgment and say, "Now we're going to do the middle rudiments." And you go ahead and do the middle rudiments in a very *brisk* fashion.

Now, in listing, you peculiarly must look much more like an auditor at the time you are doing rudiments and middle rudiments than you would in a Prepcheck session. You must really look like an auditor when you were doing these things because you've so little looked like an auditor before then. There you are, scribbling away and saying, "Mm-hm, mm-hm, yes, mm-hm, fine," and you write, and you write and paper and trying to catch up. And the pc sees he's got sweat streaming off your brow. He sort of slows down, and we see that we have two pages here now – we've listed two pages on everything else so that sounds good. So we say, "All right. Now we're going to do some middle rudiments." And right about that moment, you fix him with your beady eye, you know? And man you really do those middle rudiments.

Now, "In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Invalidated? Failed to reveal? Yes? What have you failed to reveal? Hmmm. All right, good. I'll check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal? Good." Get that clean – clean as a wolf's tooth – finish it up. you say, "All right. Now we're going back to listing."

Put in the R-factor and you read off your next line – read it off as a good auditing command. That’s really the last auditing command you’re going to give him till you’ve listed two pages. Don’t you see? You’re going to read it to him occasionally, going to remind him of it.

Your first one is, “Who or what would not oppose catching catfish?”

And he says, “a grizzly bear,” and so forth. And he – you go ahead and you write “Mm-hm, mm-hm, mm-hm, fine, fine, fine.” Your actual acknowledgment is when you’ve finished listing for that list. Then you give him the cheery, “Thank you” and you’ve got to take over control of the session again.

It’s one of these awfully long auditing answers. You see, “who or what” are not singular. You consider them as a plural auditing request. And if you consider it as a plurality of auditing request, then you’re not always getting in his road by saying – he’s saying, “A grizzly bear, a lion, a – a – a – a wolf,” and – and right about the time he said, “a grizzly bear,” you see, you said, “Thank you. Now, who or what would not oppose catching catfish?” What are you doing burning up time, man? He knows what he’s talking about. He hasn’t lost the auditing command, see? What are you doing getting in his road?

Well, he sort of runs down and you know you got to make two pages on this sprint. See? He sort of runs down and you say, “All right. Now, who or what would want – would not oppose catching catfish?” See? “Got some more there?” See, and go on running, and he thinks about it and so forth, and he’ll get some more. Now, supposing – supposing you had a – you had a goal set and you actually – yourself – and you had to get two pages out of this pc. How are you going to get the two pages out? Well, it’s by throwing the middle rudiments in when he just refuses to go on. Well, he says, “That’s all I can think of.” Well, you see he hasn’t thought of any anyhow. So you get the – you get the middle rudiments in. And also get them in when you have finished the list. you see? So that’s the additional use. you *must* get them in when you have stopped listing a list of any length, you see? You *must* get them in, but you coax him into additional listing by getting them in when he stops.

He’s sitting there and he’s saying, “Ah, *mmmm, hrrrrr*, I just can’t think of any more. I mean, it’s all too dreadful.”

And you’ve got two pages to go and you’ve only done one. you see? So you better roll up your sleeve and you say, “All right. Well, thank you.” See? And,

“Now let’s get some middle rudiments in before we go on listing on this list.” You get the reality factor in there, see? Never let him think you’re going over to some other list. Get them in, square them up, find out what it was, and he’ll come back up, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. You see? You got your two pages. You say, “All right, that’s it. We hit our quota here. Thank you very much. All right. We got that now – thank you. Good. Thank you. Thank you!” He’s now going to run four pages on you, don’t you see?

You say, “All right. We’re going to do some middle rudiments here before we go on to the next list. All right? Good! Good. All right.” And go ahead and do so.

Pc takes handling on lists. And you sit there as an animated wound-up stenographer, see, you’re going to have a bad time. You’ve got to control that session. But the liability of a listing session is, you look like you’re so little in control when you’re writing the thing, but of course you, in resumption of control you have to do with a little more power than you would ordinarily do so.

But it’s all very delicate and it’s very easy to smash these items down; it’s very easy to glum it up one way or the other. Now, if you fake one item – just like listing a goals list – if you fake one, you know very well you may never null these things; you probably never will. And supposing you say, “Because we’re never going to null these things, it doesn’t matter whether I understood did he say ‘a wolf’ or ‘a wuff?’” You’ve entered a missed withhold into the session and it’s going to blow up. So you have to ask him *right then when you missed it*, “I didn’t get that. Did you say, ‘a wolf?’”

“No,” he said, “I said ‘a wuff.’”

You say, «A wuff? What’s a wuff?” See, remember. Remember – TR 2. “What’s a wuff?”

“Well, a wuff’s a wuff. Well, they’re big, boundy things that – they’re big, boundy things, you know, and they have hair all over them. And some – oh, they were on some other planet around here!”

“Oh, a kind of animal on another planet. Is that it?”

“Oh, yeah,” he said. “A wuff”

“Oh-ho!” you say. “Well, good. Good.” And you write it down.

But you just let it go on the basis of “*Mm-hm*, I’m just going to fake it in,” you know? And the next thing you know he’s slowing down and you’re slowing down, and your auditing is tiring you out, and you don’t know whether you’re going or coming.

Now, keep your R-factor in but also keep those missed withholds off the auditor, huh? TR 2 says that you understand. And he gives you a bunch of porridge and you don’t know where to pour it. you better find out, man! He sounds quite – quite – quite raspy sometimes. He’ll sound quite snarly to you sometime. “What are you – idiot? What’s the matter with you? You don’t know what a wuff is? You know? A wuff! You know? A wuff! A wuff! A wuff! A wuff! A wuff!”

Well, the reason he’s acting like this is because he thinks he – you have a missed withhold. That’s the only reason the asperity, and as soon as you eventually get it, if you really do get it – the apparency of the missed withhold disappears and that makes it all right,

see? The thing to do wrong at that time is not to get it. you want to know what a wuff is; he can tell you what a wuff is. Of course, it really doesn't matter to a hill of beans whether – factually, whether you get that it's a wuff or a wolf or a what, because you're never going back over it again, *except* if you didn't understand it. And a falsity enters into the session there which can crash the whole session, you see?

Next thing you know you don't like auditing this pc. Your hand gets so tired when you write. There'll be all kinds of things like this. It's just missed withholds; you didn't know what the hell the pc was talking about. You were missing them, then the pc gets sensitive to these things, you know? And then it enters into the tone of your voice. And next thing you know, his session is going out, and he doesn't feel like listing, and you can't keep the middle rudiments in, and God help us all.

Keep your R-factor up and for God's sakes understand what the pc is saying before you go on. Very, very important.

Now, you look over the lists quite routinely, count them up; make sure they're in parity; do good administration on the thing; make it so these things can be looked over and so on. one of the things you do with a list or one of the things you will notice about a list, is when an actual goal is being listed out that the items will transfer over from list to list. And it almost is a test that when an item has been on all four lists, why, that's about the way it is. It's very funny, but I mean, the item will transfer.

“Officer.” “An officer is something that would want to catch catfish,” and then “An officer is something that would not want to catch catfish,” and then “An officer is something that would oppose catching catfish,” and then “An officer is something that would not oppose catching catfish.” As idiotic as it may seem, he's even thinking of a game warden, you know? He would not oppose catching catfish. By this time, it's gone the full route, and all four flows are discharged off the item, and the item is fully discharged against other items and it lies null. So you find the whole list tears on through this.

Pc is trying to do this or is trying to strain at it or something like that – he will soon fall wise to the whole thing.

Well, now, that is listing. After listing is completed, find yourself a new goal. I wish I could tell you how many goals there should be on the new list for – to find the new goal. I can't at this particular time. However, I can make a very good forecast founded on very accurate information that the list would only be about half as long and that the length of time it would take to find it is briefer and the amount of items it would take to list it out are less and you get – as we already have had ample experience of in Routine 3s – you get a dwindling quantity of everything. And eventually you can't get anything and nothing will stay in and so forth, and you hit the pc on the rim and he rings for an hour.

You should, with this particular thing, wind up at the other end of the line with a – with a Theta Clear. Now, it's also my guess that on most pcs you will eventually find a type of goal that you find in the basics of Scientology. These things will register – *suddenly* register. Why didn't they register before? Is there one basic goal for all pcs? Oh, yes! But they daren't reach it and it's not real.

You want the goal that registers now – not the perfect goal – because they eventually get back earlier and earlier and earlier and earlier on the track and they will eventually run into prime, prime, prime (exclamation point) postulate, which sweeps all before it. you will see then that there's a broader generality going into this thing and its regular progress back on the track. Different areas are being tapped; different subject matter being hit.

What happens to the GPM as it is being listed? Actually, the repetition of items gets the discharge off of the basic postulate which you call a goal. And the definition of a goal is: a basic postulate for whom the individual has taken full responsibility. Therefore, as that tends to be discharged – that is to say, the items (bricks built up on that postulate) – tend to *not resist* the postulate anymore, the postulate itself runs out. And because it is the only brick that is keeping the house built, you don't get the house falling down – this is not the result of it.

You don't get the house being blown away and moved over into the next county; you don't get the house being disintegrated or sold as scrap. It's just, oddly enough, the house diminishes and diminishes, and the bricks get thinner and thinner, and you eventually have a no-brick, no-basement, no-first-floor, no-roof, no-chimney edifice. The pc is now sitting there with all the experience accumulated on the line and none of the mass, because there's no alter-is connected with it.

There's no way known to man or beast to get a prime postulate back earlier than his experience. So of course he's had it. you say, "How stable is a Clear?" A Clear is stable as you're unable to put a prime postulate ahead of the whole track again. See, that's how stable a Clear is. And of course you can't do it.

Now, that doesn't say that you couldn't get the pc sitting there gritting his teeth making a new prime postulate and going out and fighting the whole world to make that postulate stick and not have him accumulate a GPM – in another two hundred million years he'd have something to show for a GPM. He'd be in rather serious trouble, let us say, in fifteen or twenty trillion. He'd be having a rough time of it in another – another hundred trillion from now. And two hundred trillion, well, he'd be in the same condition you were when you came into Scientology.

All right. Well, that is listing and that is what is done with it and I wanted you to get all the data I had on it. Probably more data will come up, but not all the mistakes have been made yet, so I can't settle them out.

Thank you very much.

Good night!