QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD:
GOALS LISTS, FIELD AUDITORS

A lecture given on
19 July 1962

Okay. We're going to Q and A now. This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 19 July AD 12. A Q and A.

I do have an announcement to make before I do this. For those of you who have not noticed, we have a TV demonstration on Wednesday night. And this has been so successful for two consecutive weeks that next Wednesday night we're going to repeat this and the formula by which auditors are chosen for this demonstration is just by formula. It's not as some of you believe – that you have protested or are afraid or something like that. It is – there's one GAE – somebody who is off auditing because of errors. There is one person who is going along fair and there is one person who is pretty good. Now this could include of course anybody after their first week on course. So some of you needn't be too – feel too safe about it. I mean there's always a point where you shouldn't feel safe. Yes, very, very vicious.

The truth of the matter is that you have been learning so much from these things that I should feel very odd if I left them out. And perhaps I will resume my own demonstrations. But if I do, there's a possibility that it will be on a fourth night. So you just figure – just figure this; that there are some hills that have to be climbed and take this in your stride as just one of the liabilities of being on course. There's actually no sadism connected with it.

None of the instructors take any particular joy out of the smell of fear. And if I knew some way to teach you more smoothly, I would, but in this particular instance, this is a – this is a bomb. This is fine.

It has this virtue. Those that are on the demonstration sure as hell know whether their auditing is any good or not when they finished off. We tell them in no uncertain terms. And sometimes somebody's been riding along sort of blaming the pcs, you know and that sort of thing and then they turn on the wrong end of the totem pole after something like that and then they scramble like mad on their theory and practical and so forth and all of a sudden, they don't have to blame the pc anymore because the pc's getting along fine.

It's quite mysterious. You sit there on a pc, the pc's terrible, is doing awful things and have him getting ARC breaks and a very nattery pc and it's just no good. That's all – that's just – the pc's just no good, you know. And then you smooth out your E-Meter reading, you smooth out your auditing and that sort of thing and you sit there and do it right off the textbook and so forth and you come back and audit the same pc and he's just quiet as a lamb and he's good and everything's fine and goes along And you know something The pc didn't change any in the time the person's working out his GAE.

If you ever find yourself in the position of a D of P or anything like that, just remember that. Just remember that. It's very important. You as the D of P can make the most serious mistake possible for a Central Organization by trying to audit the pcs through the auditor. That is the most serious error that you can make because you'll inevitably come up with unusual solutions. Now that's very serious.

The only thing you can possibly do is handle the auditors who are auditing the pcs. That becomes an entirely different operation. You can almost differentiate between good Ds of P and poor Ds of P on that one basis. The good D of P is handling the auditors and he makes sure that the auditors can do their job and that the auditors are doing what they're supposed to be doing And the poor one tries to handle the pc without any recourse to the auditor.

Now oddly enough, the fellow who's trying to handle the pcs, if he's got very bad auditors who don't know what they're doing, probably will get better results for a while than the Director of Processing who is handling auditors, see.

When you run into the fact you haven't got any trained auditors working for you, you'd better handle those pcs because nobody else is. But this lays in its own trap. In the long run, you'd get far further bringing those auditors up to the point where they can handle the pcs. And your results also will be better and improve as you go along All this is quite important. You wouldn't think that that much – that there'd be that much difference in just those two points of view, but there is a terrific difference. I look at the auditors reports from a – from HGCs coming in from all over the world and I can tell you at a glance whether the D of P is handling auditors or pcs.

All right. Q and A. What question would you like to ask?

The oracle is open. Yes, Merrill.

Female voice: on this, you know, testing for a complete list on goals . . .

Testing for complete list on goals.

Female voice: Mmm. I'm wondering if you could null, say, part of the list and there's a question, see, if you know the list is complete, you go back and give the test, you know, like

reading half a dozen goals or more to see if you get any TA. If the fact that you had nulled, see, those goals – these are the ones at the beginning of the list – would this make any difference as far as that TA. . .

I can tell you that it would make no difference.

Female voice: Hmmm.

If the list is not complete and the rudiments are in, you will get TA action on an incomplete goals list. That is something on the order of, "If you wind up a clock, it runs. If you don't wind up a clock, it doesn't run."

Female voice: Thank you.

Yeah. That's one of those open and shut data. There were some 3D and 3D Criss Cross tests for completeness of list. Any one of those tests could be applied for the completeness of a goals list. It's about all that we ever salvaged from 3D Criss Cross which we're not using anyplace now. With *horror I* read through from an organization the other day – after we had trained everybody on 3D Criss Cross, I sent a dispatch out *no, no, no, no, no, no, don't do that. No, no, no.* Abandon it. Go around the organization and tear them all up. But actually there was still a datum in 3D Criss Cross that was quite valid and that was there were a number of tests for complete lists and all of those are very valid for the tests of goals. You can take and read as little as a half a dozen if you're really watching your meter – half a dozen goals and tell whether you got TA action or not. Man, a complete goals list is the flattest, limpest fish you've ever handled. It's as floppy as a president's handshake. No kidding

Okay. Thank you, Merrill.

Female voice: That leads me to a second question on that.

Well, I don't know if you can have a second one or not. Go ahead.

Female voice: Well, if you were making a second test, see, after going on listing some more, would you use those same first goals or would you go on . . .

Honey, it doesn't matter what set of goals you used. you know, you could even use the ones you thought you'd nulled. I mean it's that much of an open and shut question. Because one of the things they won't do is stay null on an incomplete list. Oh, they pop in and out like jack-in-the-boxes. You've never quite noticed this.

Let's take some list where the goals have stayed in and had to be rubbed out with a – with a branding iron or something like that, you know. you could just *hear the grind* going on in the session. "To *catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. Grrrrrr. Grrrrrr.* Still in."

Get the pc's rudiments in, polish him all up. Get everything all fine. Get a Prepcheck done on listing and then go back and, to your horror, those that you think you have erased will have some life in them. It's something on the order of trying to jump up and down on a bed made out of steel, you know. It doesn't sink.

Charge on a goals list is expended only by listing of goals, not by nulling of goals. It's only by listing. And you really got to get that list flat. What was your exact question?

Female voice: Umm. On making a second test . . .

On making a second test . . .

Female voice: The – the, yeah – for completeness.

Yeah.

Female voice: You use those same first goals.

Yeah. Well, it doesn't matter whether you use first goals, last goals, but I actually would take, just because it's more seemly to the pc, I would take some goals I had just done. I'd just tell the pc to shut up and read them once. Just read them once. Not try to null anything. Just spend all of my time watching the meter, see, you know. "To catch catfish. To shoot tigers. To ride waterbucks." And keep that thing in the center.

You know that a complete goals list stays in about three goals on a page of thirty or forty. Ohh, that's . . . And I can tell every time by looking at that part of the goals list, which was added on and has been nulled. You can't tell by the number of strikes opposite the first of the goals list.

Let's say a fellow did a goals list last April. And the first five pages have got X's and slants after them and they've been nulled out four times and all of that sort of thing and they died hard, you see. And, you can't take those first few pages and tell anything about how easy the thing is nulling because obviously those are old goals that have been gone over before the list was completed, while the list was still charged. So to make a real test of the thing, you just glance at the pc's goals list the auditor has been doing on the pc and take that – a section that he has been nulling since he added the last goals. Well, that doesn't mean three or four goals. You could add three or four, I mean you went into a long business of listing, see.

Now, when you go down and null those things, that's the page to look at for the test. And you just look at that page and you'll find in, in, in, out, in, in, in, out, in, in. Oh, come off of it. Come off of it. That goals list is not complete. That is all there is to that. It's not complete. You can actually test by nulling, you can test by reading to the pc, you've – there are numbers of ways of testing given in the 3D Criss Cross info letter and they're just all – that list is charged. You want it to go out,out,out,out,out,out,out,out,out,out,out. This is just on three reads, see. In. Out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, in. In.

Out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out, out. That's the end of that page. And then you really know. you really know.

Now, in view of the fact that it really doesn't take much charge off the case to list goals, it's – you sort of had it, you see. Hence, your long, long lists, the long, long lists; because listing a goal doesn't take much charge off per goal, see. It's not like listing items. You list items and the charge just goes off in all directions. *Zoom, zoom, zoom, zoom, zoom.* But not listing goals. You don't get proportionate quantities of charge off. And when I first looked at this, I myself had found enough goals and had them stay in without making long and arduous lists, that I was obscured on this particular fact and after a great deal of study, of what I was doing – not just what you were doing, but I also myself was doing on goals and the trouble I had had occasionally on goals and so on – I recognized you had to list the charge off the goals list. And if you got the charge off of the goals list, why, *violà! You'll* find the goal, bang! Just like that. Stands up like Pikes Peak, you know. It's very obvious. But if you haven't got all the charge off, it's mixed up in all this other charge stuff.

Now, don't feel that you could list the list until no goal would read. The goal will still read. Now, theoretically and only theoretically, you could list goals until only the goal would read three times for three reads, see. Theoretically. But you'd probably have to list about 50 percent more goals than you would have to have, see, just to take the last bit of charge off.

Rudiments really have to be in for goals listing. Otherwise the charge doesn't blow as you list the list, see. Listing goals is auditing. Another question's going to come up in line with this.

I probably should have given you a 3GA lecture this second lecture, but I was half of a mind to do so, but I got a piece of technology that's in the middle of something here. And until that's wrapped up, I didn't care to really give you a lecture on it. Now I haven't even got a withhold on you.

And, but listing goals can be done by a pc all by himself, see, perfectly happily. Perfectly valid. It is not self-auditing Don't put it under that category. They've been doing this kind of thing all their lives, sitting around wondering what their goal is. It's just life, you know. So let them go ahead and make a goals list and even keep whanging them along with the end of the towel saying, "All right. All right. So you're all run down at 350. Well, go on. List it up to 850."

You know, just keep pushing them that way. You're not bothering to get their rudiments in or anything like that and then give the list a test as your auditing action to find out whether or not it gives TA action. But to do that, you'd better get the rudiments in. You'd better give them a little bit – you'd better give them a Prepcheck like the June 11th bulletin, see. And then give that list a test. And if you got TA action, you could go on listing, and

probably will, but don't be harassed if the pc keeps going home and turning out lists of 50 or 60 and bringing them in. Feel this is fine, not otherwise. Perfectly okay.

Now, when we get into listing lines of items from that goal, we get into a slightly different proposition because I myself am piloting through and figuring out.... A lot of individual listing without an auditor can be done with the resulting gains. There is no doubt about this. It's possibly five or six to one, however. You spend five or six hours if you were listing by yourself to accomplish what you would accomplish in about one hour of listing with an auditor. It's quite interesting Quite interesting that you can do individual listing. I'm doing a lot of listing like that myself right now because there is no way you got any auditing time for me. Everybody's studying processing No time to process, you know. That sort of thing.

But listing only gets out of hand – if you're doing it personally and individually – if you don't get an occasional Prepcheck to straighten out the subject of listing, you see. Now, a guy doing a Prepcheck on himself in order to continue listing, now, now, now we're in trouble, see. Now, we're going to go to hell in a balloon if we don't watch it. So if individual listing were taking place, you would have to have at least a Prepcheck going on by an auditor. That would be your minimum requirement.

You have to watch also an equality of list. you have to make sure those lists stay the same length. And people listing by themselves get careless about this. And they run on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and all of a sudden they're 250 items ahead of any other list. And they get sick at their stomach and dizzy and they feel terrible. They go around in horrible shape for three or four days and then they suddenly say, "I wonder if one of these lists is longer than another."

The best way to check it is not by numbering items but just by numbering pages. You don't have to be accurate – 400, 400, 400 – because about the average number occurs on a page. If you write very small, you can take a double spread of your legal-size paper. You know. And put four lists on that double spread. You can see whether or not they're even fast enough. But just do it – "equality by pages." There are this many pages and this many pages, you know, that many pages. So don't try to do it by number of items. Do it by number of pages. You'll come out much better in the long run.

But apparently listing all by itself as an action – whether of goals or of items – apparently don't come under the heading of self-auditing. They don't – they don't have the same thing. But listing of items – you apparently get lots less charge off, or listing of goals you get lots less charge off than you would under an auditor, see. So just be prepared to list lots longer. But it's a good thing to know that.

You get swamped with pcs sometime and you got four pcs going clear left and right and they are standing around on one foot and then the other foot and you figure if you keep

going this way, by the time you've delivered a thousand hours of auditing necessary to clear them by Christmas and it's to your interest to clear them fairly rapidly, why, just keep giving them a swift kick and tell them to list and bring their lists in and prepcheck them, see. And then list awhile after you finish the prepcheck and get them – lists equalized again and let them go list awhile, you know. They won't do themselves any harm at all. This is actual experience on this line.

They will do this. They'll change the lines. They'll wobble. They'll just decide the line should be worded wrong – differently. They all of a sudden reword their line, particularly if it's right there ahead of a very heavy item.

The reason I didn't give you a lecture on 3D Criss Cross tonight is definitely in the direction of listing lines, lines, wording of lines. I'll tell you something about that. I'll give you as much as I know about it.

You've got four vectors. There's the vector of inflow. There's the vector of outflow. There's a bulletin on this. And then there's the inhibition of the inflow and the inhibition of the outflow. On beingness goals, the wording want-not-want, oppose-not-oppose, is apparently adequate. At least it's cleared to date an awful lot of people. But they all had beingness goals. How interesting. Or they had goals they were interpreting in this way. Or they got by with it somehow. Now, we have just collided with doingness goals. And there's doingness goals and there's havingness goals. And the horrible thought has reached in to the midst of this happy state of affairs that maybe the lines for a doingness goal have to be worded differently than the beingness goal and maybe the lines for a havingness goal have to be worded differently than the other two.

At the moment, I'm only working on a doingness goal and now this is a – quite a problem. If you draw on your sheet there two – go ahead and draw – two arrows facing each other. Just draw two pointed arrows facing each other. Name one outflow and the other inflow. And then below that draw two little arrows facing the opposite directions. In other words, on the inflow, draw one facing the opposite direction. Little, short arrow. And on the outflow draw a little, short arrow which is facing against the outflow. Get the idea?

Now, you draw these four arrows. The inflow and the outflow are the main flows. But those little, tiny arrows are the things that oppose the main flows. You've got to list at least this many things to make the package unwind on a goal and the pc go Clear. Now, it's very fine to have that inflow one and the outflow one and so forth. To have all of these nicely coincidental and just worded "want" you see, "not-want." See, that'd be the little short arrows – "not-want." That's the opposition to "want" and then the other one to be "opposed" and the little, short arrow under that one to be "not-opposed." That wording has been adequate so far in the goals worded.

We're all of a sudden starting to run into a strata of doingness goals where this wording is not adequate and where this situation has begun to exist: where the pc confuses – because there's – isn't any seeming difference between them to the pc, the "not-oppose" and "not-want." So he actually is wording the outflow, the inflow and a third line. The inflow and the outflow and a third line – which overlists one line, doubles the listing on one line and omits another line entirely. And on that four – four-line wording that you have there, the pc usually is listing only these: The "want" – call that the outflow line for the fun of it – the "oppose" which is the inflow line and then "not-oppose," because "not-want" when you get into doingness, is too identified with, "not-oppose." And actually all he really does is, "not-oppose" mostly "not-opposes" all the way down the line. Or he could go in reverse and list only the "not-wants" and just skip the "not-oppose." In other words, when you ask him "not-oppose" he just lists the "not-want." In other words, it isn't articulated enough for the pc to get this thing straightened out.

It is on a beingness goal, but it isn't on doingness goals, so we run into this limitation. What we really want, is the outflow line can, of course, be designated as, "want to do this goal" whatever it is, and the inflow line would be "oppose this goal" whatever it is. you don't – you're not using the word this goal that I'm just giving you this goal instead of fabricating a goal for you.

And then on the inhibition line – you see, the inhibited outflow – you know, your four flows: outflow, inflow, inhibited outflow, inhibited inflow. Those are the four basic flows. If you haven't got that many, it won't go together. Of course, God help us if we have to list sixteen flows or something like that. See, that would give us all the flows there are, but you don't need that many to clear a pc, fortunately. But you do need an articulation of these four flows so the pc never makes a mistake. He never comes a cropper, he doesn't. And to do that, you'd have to word them something like this: "Want to goal." And then that inhibition line down there, "pullback" or some such wording "from goal."

You see, there's your outflow. Then there's the "pullback," see. This "pullback" vector has got to be just called just that on a doingness goal. Something that gives this distinct idea that it's a pullback of an outflow. In other words, taming and slowing down that outflow. And then over here, on the inflow, well, you have "oppose," well, that's dandy. It's all perfectly all right. No reason to change the word "oppose" or the wording of that line who or want – "who or what would oppose goal" undoubtedly the i-n-g form of the goal. That's fine. But how about the opposition to the opposition? We'd have to have something that said, "pull back the opposition."

"Who or what would restrain opposition to the goal?" You see that other line? "Who or what would restrain opposition to the goal?" And we get a whole new series of packages. So you got – you got wording that goes something like this: "Who or what would – Who or

what would – pull back someone or something from, 'to catch catfish'?" See, goal. "Who or what would pull **back something or** someone – someone or something from catching catfish?" see. "Who or what would want to catch catfish? Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" And "Who or what would restrain opposition to catching catfish?" That would be the fourth line. Well, this would probably clear even a doingness goal, you see. But this is under present action. It is better to have just that wording you've got right now on any kind of a doingness goal than the earlier wording. The earlier wording's liable to get you into trouble if you have a doingness goal.

We've all of a sudden come up with several doingness goals. We hadn't been listing them before. Apparently, beingness goals are easier to find or something like that, see.

Now, you know what I'm talking about? It's got to communicate to the pc that he's got to list a bunch of items that would want to do this goal, see. Whatever it is. And a bunch of items that would pull him back from doing this goal or pull back items from doing this goal. And it would oppose doing this goal and something that would restrain opposition to the goal. And then we get the four main flows expressed properly, particularly for a doingness.

What has entered the complication on it is a thetan who has a doingness goal usually winds up in a stuck flow and then he has a hell of a time for himself. See, he's stuck flow. Let's say the goal is "to shoot buffalo." Well, man, he's not about to be able to shoot buffalo after all these trillennia. The mere thought of shooting buffalo causes him to put on the brakes with a scream, see. And you've got to list what's putting on the brakes with a scream. Now, only this little question enters into all of this. Apparently, he could also get answers on "could" and "can't" for the goal, making six lines, throwing everything to hell, throwing it all out of balance and in actual fact you're moving on up toward your sixteen. Those four lines, as far as we know at the present moment, would operate as a clearing action.

Now, I am fully prepared to have a havingness goal require a different set of words. Life is interesting, isn't it? Get something all buttoned up and then somebody falls in your lap and says, "Hey!"

Of course, all the laws of motion are active in these goal lines, you see and the poor guy who has an outflow or a reaching or a "meet up with" type of goal has gotten on a stuck flow, so he's accumulated tremendous numbers of things which are inhibiting him from performing the goal. And frankly, he is much more likely to perform the goal than not to perform the goal. The mere fact that he has that goal is giving him trouble in executing it. The fellow who has "to throw away bread" as a goal, you see. you let a piece of bread – just sit – put it on the kitchen table, the far corner of the kitchen table, you see and without any human volition of any kind whatsoever, I guarantee you that piece of bread or that whole loaf of bread is going to slither across and slap him in the face. He's going to be the damnedest collector of bread you ever ran into. And yet he might stand for hours in front of a shop

window realizing he couldn't possibly even come close to that bread much less throw it away. And that nobody could ever truck bread or do anything with bread. These are the social convictions he is now saddled with. They're not being expressed in the goal form, but he wants to really do the goal form, but he is in a position where he would – really would hardest dramatize something the complete reverse. And then he will also tell you if you omit these lines that his case isn't moving, that nothing is happening, that nothing could happen, that nothing is reaching anything. And, of course, he's just telling you what the basic goal is. But that's because you're omitting this restrained outflow line. And the restrained outflow line is the one he never notices. And that's quite interesting.

Now, how we get over this particular hump – this is an easy one. We'll get over this hump, but it is a hump that's been brought on. For instance, we've had a pc here that had a – had an outflow goal which is kind of an outflow around inflow goal, see.

And a redesign of lines – a redesign of lines lets it come up easier on the pc. But this pc's lines were w. She might have gone Clear on the first wording without any difficulty whatsoever if they hadn't been overlisted and if the wording hadn't been completely changed. The pronoun **was changed** in the goal and made a different goal and so forth. Made a mess out of it. Well, anyhow, how are you getting along with that?

Female voice: With what?

The goal.

Female voice: Her auditor's on GAE.

Huh?

Female voice: Her auditor's on GAE.

Oh, your auditor's on GAE. All right. How do you like that? Not only is it not moving, but the auditor then gets put on GAE. People don't have any luck at all.

All right. I told you all I know about that. It'd be safest to word by the wording I gave you on any goal if you want to know the truth of it. And then any little falderal on the situation wouldn't mess you up. you had to be just a little more positive. Completely in spite of the fact that we've had nine people go free needle with the original wording, see. But the interesting part of it is that the doingness and reachingness type of goal wasn't going free. So the old man suddenly pulled up his socks and said, "Here it is. And – the Marines are about to land." Landed, figured it out and triggered it up and so on. What are you going to do when I'm not around to fix that up?

Anyhow, let's have another question. Yes, Jean.

Female voice: Um – question on listing. At what point can you begin to allow your lists to go uneven towards the end of listing?

At what point can you allow your lists to go uneven toward the end of listing Now, you mean the – when needles are going free?

Female voice: Yes.

Ahhh. At what point? The point of the first free needle. At what point can you allow your lists to go uneven at the end of listing. And by that end of listing, she doesn't mean in the session. She means in series of intensives adding up to clearing. She's talking about clearing now.

All right. And that is taken care of by the law of the free needle. You never list a free needle. *Never. Never. Never. Never. Never. Don't. Don't. Don't. Don't. Don't* ever list a free... I've had guy after guy around here, Jean, who's try – been trying to list free needles. They don't recognize that a free needle is total expression of the cleanest needle you can get, see. So never, never, never, never, never list a free needle. That answers your question. You list exactly to free needle. You say that needle is free.

Now, just for Esther's benefit, you don't sit there and say, "Wow! *Look at that. A free needle. Hey! Hey! Look at that! Ha! Ho-ho! What do you know? Lying to it, I got a free needle. You won't look. Look. You know."* Poor Esther. That was what happened to her first free needle back in June. Gruesome, man. Huh?

Female voice: I – I'd like to know how come that you can have a free needle when the wording is wrong on the list.

No. You could – you . . .

Female voice: That's what happened to me.

Yes. But you could have had one that was a reinterpretation and you were reinterpreting as you did it and so forth. And you see, clearing isn't really all that touchy, but you walk down and you must have been very close to it and then, was it one line or two lines went clear?

Female voice: One.

One line went clear. And that's pretty easy, you see. So what happened to you actually is one line went clear and you had in effect a first dynamic Clear all of a sudden created with the other three lines not free. Freak. But it could happen very easily. It's not even mysterious.

Now, your question, first free needle. After that you don't pay a doggone bit of attention to the length of lines. I'm very glad you asked the question by the way, Jean. Don't pay any attention to the length of lines after that. you just list a free needle.

Female voice: And you never go back to the one that's had a free needle. That's the point that I'm making

Oh, yes, you do.

Female voice: Ooh.

Because it's not going to be free now.

Female voice: Yes.

Your free needle is a sporadic phenomenon.

Female voice: Yeah.

So, you list line one and all of a sudden you've got a free needle on line one. Take it in the swim. Don't fire off rockets. And say, "Well, that's it." See? Good. The needle's free. There it is drifting. You might have done two or three before you suddenly realized you had a free needle on your hands and you say, "All right. That's it. That's the end of that line . . . " Go to line two. All right. You'll find that the second you start asking for line two, you haven't got a free needle. This is the phenomena that demonstrates itself, see.

And you list, list, list, list, list, list, list and if you're listing, all of a sudden pretty long, not getting anyplace and that sort of thing and the pc is starting to grope for things, it's just as you were doing before. That you've had a free needle doesn't interrupt your behavior with line two. And then you go to line three and you list and you go to line four and you list and maybe line four goes free. Well, the second it goes free, you drop it.

Go to line one. You'll find this is very unfree now because of the four flow manifestation. See, you've moved a lot of bank in on this guy by listing the other three lines, you see. So you list that down. And supposing it doesn't go free. Well, you just list it the normal length of time that you would list a list, don't you see.

Female voice: Yes.

Now, you – maybe you'll find two going free. The second it goes free, you come off of it and go someplace else. you got the idea? So you're keeping up your equality as long as something isn't going free. But then you're going to get to this interesting stage. That's the early stage. That's your first free needle and it cuts in and out and you'll see it a couple of times in the session. And each time you saw it, you come right off of that line, you see. And you'll eventually settle the thing down to where you'll list a line to a free needle and then list the next line for a while. The needle's not now free. And it doesn't go free. And then you list line three and that goes free. And so you go immediately to line four and it doesn't go free. And then you go to line one and it goes free. And you stop right now on it. And shift to your next one, line two and it goes free. And you go to your next line three and it doesn't go free now. And you list that a reasonable length of time. And then you go to list four and it goes free. And the next thing you know, you've got line one to free needle, line two to free needle, line three to free needle, line four to free needle, line one to free needle, line two to free

needle, line three to free needle. They go off. They'll shut off every time you start to list the other line. And finally, it doesn't matter what line you list. You're going to have a free needle. And at that time, you don't list another single item. you just – you're there. What you do then is let the pc go around and acclimate himself and – to the operating atmosphere and have him get up in the morning and look at himself on the E-Meter and wondering if he's still at the clear read. you know how they do. And you just assess for a new goal. And maybe his old goals list has come alive again. But probably the safest thing to do is assess for a new goal. See, you have brand-new goals now.

Goes through the whole procedure again, but it takes less long. And once more the law of the free needle is never list beyond the point of a free needle on any given line. Never do it. The reason you never do it is because you're going to list him into the next GPM.

You can overrun a free needle. It's not serious. But you can list a free needle for a half an hour and have the next GPM start coming up. Everything starts pulling the wrong way. you get a terrific rock slam. Everything starts going wild and so on. You're just pulling the next section of track up where it has no business to be at all. And then you run into a little bit of trouble. And your pc's going up and down. Your pc doesn't know what's going on and that sort of thing. Well, actually, it's a violation of the Auditor's Code. It's running a flat process. Listing a free needle is running a flat process. That's all. Does that answer your question?

Female voice: Yes, sir.

All right. Probably even more thoroughly than you thought.

Female voice: Yes.

All right. But you appreciate it.

Female voice: Yes.

All right. That's better. All right. Yes, Esther.

Female voice: I'd like to know about the – the difference in these goals that are beingness, doingness and havingness goals.

They just say it. They say be and do and have.

Female voice: What I mean – I – I know what the difference is between do, have and be.

No. They – they say it.

Female voice: I know. That I know that, but what I need to know is something different. Can you . . .

All right. She wants to know the difference between a beingness, doingness and havingness goal and . . .

Female voice: Can you tell . . .

Can you tell . . .

Female voice: . . . the um – how far back these goals would go by the difference in the goals whether it's a doingness or beingness or havingness. Whether it would be further back on the track or so? That's what I mean.

Whether a beingness or doingness or havingness goal would be the furthest back on the track and that sort of thing. I don't think you could tell a thing about it.

Female voice: You couldn't determine that?

I don't know. I have no data on that whatsoever.

Female voice: That's what I'm curious about.

No. I have no data on that whatsoever. By theory, by theory the beingness goal is earliest on the track, the doingness goal is mediumly on the track and the havingness goal is the late one on the track, but that is by theory and how these pancakes are stacked on the griddle and eaten on the plate, God help us, we don't know. Okay?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Yes, Merrill.

Female voice: I've got something sort of wild here. I wonder, you know, if you ever do find out after you've listed on a goal and everything, sort of what cycle it was. you know?

If you ever find out?

Female voice: Yeah.

Oh, I'm sure you'll know someday.

Track opens up and you suddenly remember where it was and . . . Trouble is nobody ever comments on it because the time the thing is run out it is totally unimportant. All right. David?

Male voice: Got a question that's not sequitur to this actually, Ron. It's um – what would you like to see a field auditor leaving here do?

What would I like to see a field auditor leaving here do? Now, that's a – that's an unfair question because its answer is a divisional – I mean I would like to see a field auditor leaving here, help out in a Central Org for a short time just to help himself out. But next to that, I would like to see him sit down somewhere and accumulate any and all people who have ever been trained in his immediate vicinity and start winding them back into the line, pick up any and all pcs he ever had around and straighten them up and start them back into good shape again. In other words, this process is basically an ARC-type action. If you pick up the ARC

breaks in your immediate vicinity, or pick up the unfinished cycles in your immediate vicinity, anybody leaving here now at the state of training he should be in, would actually be able to accomplish some rather remarkable things, not at a great sweat. People are more likely to fall on your head if you tell them you're there, you know, than otherwise. There isn't any great action.

For instance, Dorothy Broaded went back to Seattle area and, I don't know, she had about sixty people and all kinds of things were going on and everybody getting very excited for her. She'll have a hard time staying out of the running like I used to do. I had more difficulty not auditing than I did auditing, see. People on the front doorstep all the time and that kind of action.

Now, there are certain – sometimes in a vicinity there are quite a few people who have been trained at one stage or another. Didn't really finish their certification or requirements. Some of them did. Some of them aren't doing anything. Some of them are. There's some Book Auditors around that did this and that. There are some people who are just interested who did this and that, but they're sort of hung up, see, to some degree or not hung up at all. They may still be going forward too.

Well, anybody who has his hands on good training and good performance and can do something like that would only have to reach in their particular direction just to some slight degree to get the show rolling. And a lot of the auditors who have left here that – I've had to come down on them with a club. They're just auditing day and night, you know. I mean that kind of thing. And very busy doing lots of things.

So what would I like to see them do? Well, there's lots of things I'd like to see people do, but I know inevitably what they will do. They'll either collect the Scientologists in their area and see that they get some auditing and straighten the thing out and keep it going or they won't. All right. You bet. Okay.

Male voice: oh, to carry on with that, John told me when I stopped up to see him that "Don't go out in the sun and cast a shadow because the people will trip over it and you'll be completely snowed under."

Yes. Yes. Poor. . . That's a good thing. He says don't go out in the sun and – Saint Hill graduate here – don't go out in the sun and cast shadows because people will trip over and you'll be snowed under ever afterwards. That's true. I've gotten some letters from people that he hasn't deigned to write to and they are very upset with him for not instantly getting them 7,640 hours of auditing and that sort of thing. He got more than he bargained for. Yes, Ian.

Male voice: Ron, E-Meter reading

Right.

Male voice: How soon are we going to get some visual aids on this?

How soon are you going to get some visual aids. Your best visual aid – somebody was telling me a couple of weeks or something like that and I see from a head nod here that it's probably still that same estimate.

Male voice: Maybe a bit earlier.

Huh?

Male voice: Maybe a bit earlier.

Maybe a bit earlier. Your best visual aid at the present moment is not asking questions or putting some guy quasily indifferently into session. The student sits down and takes hold of the cans. Another student sits there and watches the meter. And nobody says anything except the coach and the student. The coach stands behind him. Or no coach. I just sit there and watch the meter. And just call the reads. And call 50 percent of the time no reads and the other 50 percent of the time reads. Now, that in itself is terrific training if entered in upon without messing up anybody's bank or anything like that. And I think possibly anybody doing that here oh, probably at the other end of the line, will be grooved in enough when he's really good at that to collide with the first visual aids we will have. And I think that would get us over the jump. Does that answer your question?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

You bet. Okay. Any other questions? All right. That's fine. Thank you very much. Have a good auditing day tomorrow and a good weekend.

Good night.