

ROUTINE 3GA DATA ON GOALS, PART I

A lecture given on
7 August 1962

Well, I should be much better off now after a week's layoff here, should be much better off indeed. And just worse than ever. That's what I get for taking vacations.

All right, this is what, 7 Aug., AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture one.

You are very lucky to hear this lecture, extremely fortunate. In fact, if I didn't give you this lecture you'd all be in the *zoup*. It's one of them kind of lectures.

And this has to do with goals, 3GA, data and Materials concerning. Now, this is not a lecture of a complete embrasive rundown on everything there is to know about clearing, but I'm going to give you some fast ones on the subject of HCOB Aug. 1, and HCOB Aug. 1, Issue II – the drills. And it's ROUTINE 3GA, GOALS, NULLING BY MID RUDS, and the nulling drills that go along with it.

Now, this material is taken care of pretty well in the bulletin. There is nothing particularly that one would alter in these bulletins – gives you quite a bit of data. I'm going to duplicate some of that data and I'm also going to give you a lot more tips and an amplification of the material. A lot to be known about this.

First thing you will want to know is, what if you find a wrong goal on somebody, and their head swells up five times the size and they get palpitations of the platina. What happens? What do you do? That's the first thing you want to know, because you'll do it. Sooner or later this will happen, even to you.

Most of the data on this, by the way, is subjective Got a good subjective reality on this, and a good objective reality on this.

For instance, somebody came to see me today from far off on which a goal had been found wrong, and had been listed vociferously with considerable enthusiasm by one who is now amongst you, but who was not then a Saint Hill student – so he can be forgiven, possibly. He's not amongst you at the present moment. I won't identify him any further. And I said, "Well, that's the way it is, wrong goal," and sent her down to ask Reg, out of the magnanimity of his heart, if he would not check out these goals.

Now, of course, he thought he was checking a goal out, and she thought so too, but in actual fact I sent her down to get patched up because the way you correct ... There are two ways of correcting a wrong goal. One is to check out the wrong goal that was found – or any

wrong goal that was found – within an inch of your life. In other words really check that thing out. Now, of course, it ceases to fire, it ceases to read, it ceases. But it must cease with all somatics and sensations and with all misemotion. When you have got everything off of it there is nothing left on it. Got it?

In other words by prepchecking – this is very valuable data – by prepchecking out the goal that was found wrong, you shuck off the consequences of having listed it. Interesting isn't it? Marvelous. You should have such luck. But that's the way that one is.

Find a wrong goal on somebody, and with vast enthusiasm list it for five or six or eighteen-thousand items, you see. And the person puts on two hundred and fifty pounds of weight, and a few other minor things like this occurring. Their eyeballs keep leaking blood and palpitations have begun in the heart, and gastronomic upsets are occurring as the order of the day, and medicos have been called in, morticians, and so forth, and have made a diagnosis of plumbosis of the platina, and they must operate inconsequentially. Why, that's what you do – you just prepcheck the living daylights out of the goal that was wrong and found, no matter how much it was listed.

At first it won't read. You can't – won't get much out of it. You get all the suppression off of it, and you get the reads on it and the suppressions off of it, and the reads back on it and the reads off of it, and so forth, and you go on and on and on – and you finally get rid of this thing. But you may need a few more little buttons to go along with your mid ruds. And I will give you a list of those buttons. To make a very thoroughgoing checkout of anything, you may find these buttons of some use. On the goals check HCOB, "Mistake been made" is added to the little list. That's the short Instructor's check. Well, please add, "Has a mistake been made?" on to the question that must be cleared there. Now, that's for the short form.

Now, add that – this is for a longer form – "Mistake been made? Protested? Asserted?" You've now got the bulk of it. "Confusion about?" and "Ignored – Been ignored?" You've just about got everything that is significant that will even produce a shadow of a side read on the other things, you see.

The basic things which make a wrong goal read are, of course, Suppress – that doesn't make it read, that prevents the invalidations from reading – Invalidate, Suggest – of course that's Evaluate, that's also Assert and Mistake. Now, those are the things which give you a clean tick. The Suppress, of course, pulls off the suppression and the errors now read. The errors on the goal don't read till you get all the suppress off. Now let's look at it and we realize invalidation can give it a tick just like a goals tick, except it doesn't look like a goals tick if you get to be an old veteran and seen a lot of them.

Now, a goals tick is a rapidly inspired input with a fast decay. It goes *phew*. It fires fast off the beginning and slows down rapidly. Whereas these ticks are just ticks. They go *thud, thud, thud*, and they're of equal speed more or less, but they can be mistaken very easily.

And of course if a goal has charge on it, then it can be invalidated, you see, and the invalidated picks up the charge, you see. But it still looks like an invalidation. But that invalidation has charge – not because of the invalidation but because there was charge on the

goal, you understand? You've got a question of transferred charge. You've got charge on the goal, but the goal doesn't read, but the charge transfers over if the goal is invalidated. Now, Invalidated reads. The charge transfers over to Suggest, Evaluate, Assert.

Suggest is the best of those phrases, but you can also say Evaluated, you can say Assert, make it meaningful. The Mistake, a mistake calls for sort of a ridge because it's a special kind of an invalidation.

It comes down to the fact that a goal reads on the two oldest lines of the Auditor's Code – evaluation and invalidation. But you see, either one of these have different ways you could describe it. Now, you'll get a tick out of those things. It looks like a goal, it goes *tick, tick, tick*. Of course if your needle is rising rapidly the tick is – just slows the rise – or it'll just stop the rise so it looks like a halt. But actually they're a throw-down. They fire over here from left to right, and the usual tick – something like that – if the needle were quite still, well, it'd be about anything from a sixteenth of an inch to a half an inch, from left to right in the direction marked "fall" on a Mark IV E-Meter. It's – be a sixteenth of an inch to a half an inch.

And a goal read that is clean and clear is very remarkable. It looks like a small rocket taking off that slows down rapidly. It doesn't look like these other things, but you'll get used to that by and by.

Every once in a while on nulling a goals list, by the way, you'll see this phenomenon. It isn't the goal, but you'll see a goal tick – a real goal tick. You get it clean, everything is fine and you've been saying it – you've said it a couple of times before and taken invalidations off of it and so forth and you get it all clean and you get down there and you say, "To be a tiger," and *pow*. And you say, "Boy, we've really got something here," you know. You know, make it like that ... At that point make enough excitement to throw the pc out of session, you see. And you say, you say, "To be a tiger." It doesn't read anymore, you see. Check it all over again. If you ever get one to fire, for God's sakes check it over again. Check it all over again. "To be a tiger." It's dead, it'll never fire again. R.I.P. You've taken it off the goals chain, see. It read like the goal once.

Now, that's – the goal charge transfers over to a secondary goal which merely fires once, as it frees itself from the main goal chain. But that charge, while it remains on a secondary – not the goal but a close cousin – can transfer over to an invalidation or an evaluation, you see. You get substitutes, got a series of substitutes here, see. So you pick off the invalidations and evaluations, and then you pick off the charge off the secondary goals on the list, and then you hit the goal and the goal goes *pow!* – and it goes like that every *time* – *pow, pow, pow*.

Now, of course if somebody invalidates it, it ceases to go *pow* until the evaluation is picked up. Somebody evaluates for the pc. It ceases to fire until, of course, that evaluation is picked up. You can always get this thing to fire again however – which is quite remarkable – until it has been listed completely out. And when it's listed completely out, you've got a free needle.

All right. It's a series of substitutions. In other words, the charge goes from here to there. It isn't that evaluation is going to ruin the pc – it's merely going to ruin the goal read. And you'd think it would ruin the pc if you saw some of the somatics that can occur because of it. But the whole force of it is derived from the goal itself, see. The whole force and charge of a goals list is derived from the goal.

For instance, if you haven't got *the* goal on the list, the list will be hotter than a pistol even if it's five thousand goals long. You can't cool it off, that's all. It just won't cool off until you've got the goal on it. And when it goes complete, fish – flabby cold as a list, you've got the goal on it someplace.

It isn't the number of items quantitatively that is entirely responsible for discharging the goals list. It's monitored by whether or not the goal is on the list yet, and it will stay charged up till you get it on. There's a couple of ways of making sure of this, but I'm getting ahead of my story.

Now, that charge there transfers over to the secondary goals and then that transfers over to evaluations and invalidations and charges this thing up.

When you've gotten a wrong goal then, you have simply added to the charge residual every time you listed one more item – because you're not only evaluating for the pc, you are saying, "This is your goal – to have a pie face," or something like this – and it's not, you see. And at the same time you are invalidating the actual goal – whatever it was. So these two things are happening simultaneously, and the more you list the more this thing charges up! And this can get gruesome!

If you ever were adventurous enough to list two or three thousand wrong items on each one of the four lines – well, it's almost a case for the mortician. It's horrible! I couldn't overemphasize the thing. The pc would just be walking around in circles. Usually there is abundant sensation, the pc's getting dizzier and dizzier. The pc will start passing out if you go too far. Pc just goes blah, you know – be walking down the hall and go bang, see. I mean actually pass out. A fainting sensation and that sort of thing goes along with it, and there's all kinds of these wild things, see.

Nothing to worry about because long before the pc got into this state, an auditor would start saying, "What's going on here?" you know. But they will think they are in bad enough state if they've only had a few items listed on a wrong goal. You can list four on a wrong goal and start picking up sen.

If you find a goal on the pc, you haven't checked it out yet, and the pc says, "Oh, gee-whiz, I've got my goal," you know – adding another assert to it, you see. "I've got my goal." Nice suggest, you know. "Yeah, that's fine."

He leaves the session and he goes home and he sits down and he says, "Let's see, who would want to be a pie face?" you know. "Who would want to be a pie face? Oh, well, yeah, pie man, yeah that's good, and who would oppose being a pie face? People who didn't have one, and who would not retard pie facing? I don't know if I've got that right or not."

They'll do it! You'll see somebody do it. Somebody go out of session right after you found their goal. You haven't had a chance to check the thing out – found it right at the end of the session. They'll come back in. They've done some experimenting on the thing and they'll be going, *wog-wog-wog*, you know – if it's the wrong goal. See if it's not the right one, they'll really catch it.

So this is something you must know a great deal about. Don't think of it on the basis that, "Oh well, this all applies, you see, providing I ... None of this applies, I'll just check every goal out that comes along, you see, and I'll check them all out and I'll be very careful, and then none of these things will happen to any pc I audit."

Who are you kidding'.? Just who are you kidding? First place you don't know if it's the right goal. You don't know if it's the right goal until you've listed two or three hundred items on it. Then is the first time you'd lay your paw on a stack of Bibles, put *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* on top of it to make it a fact, and swear it was the right goal, see. See, that's the only time you'd really know, because one of the tests is: Does the goal, when listed, turn on somatics on lines 1, you see, and 3. And does the goal turn on dizziness and sensation and emotion and what we generally call and refer to as "sen" on lines 2 and 4.

Now, if the goal, while you are busily listing it – on line 1 turns on dizziness and on line 2 turns on somatics – man, you've got it backwards! That's all – it's just backwards. You have been misfortunate enough, you should have gotten up and given a session that day. Why did you have to get up and give a session that day? Why didn't you have an appointment elsewhere? Because you found the oppgoal.

Now, frankly there are four goals that you can find. I'll make you secure, make you confident, make you happy and going about your business without ever a care. There are four goals: There's the goal for line 1, the goal for line 2, the goal for line 3, and the goal for line 4. *The* goal is the goal for line 1. That's the pc's goal. But the opposition goal of course is really another goal – and although it phrases out beautifully if you just say, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" you see. That will work out and it's all fine. There is – actually, you are listing another goal there. There's really another goal sitting right there. See? It'll be something or other, "To preserve our piscatorial friends," or something like this, you see. Opposition to catching catfish! It's because there's another goal sitting there. And as far as retarding goals are concerned, on lines 3 and 4, there are two other goals there too – and you know they will all fire. They'll all fire. Witness 3D, old Routine 3D. You can find 4 goals in a row that will all fire.

Now, the pc's goal is the one you want, and that is the one which fits on line 1, and that is the one that gives somatics, and that ordinarily is the one you check out. But beware one of these terribly long goals lists. If they are terribly long then the pc is listing all four goals on the same list. He's listing his's and theirs's, and his allies and his covert enemies – and he's listing them all on the same list.

He's saying, "To catch catfish. To protect and preserve our piscatorial friends," will occur consecutive. He will list 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, sometimes as nice as you please, you understand? He doesn't know whether he's himself, or his worst enemy, or what, you see. The GPM is so snarled up that just picking out anything out of it, he doesn't know whether it's friend or foe. And as you are running down a goals list he'll say, "That one made me feel dizzy." You've picked up an opposition goal. That goal is either a line 2 or a line 4 goal. "Got hmmm," he said – or, "I feel so despairing whenever you say that goal." A line 2 and a line 4. Sensation is emotion. "Goodness, I am so frightened whenever you say that." Line 2, line 4 you see – sensation, emotion. There's only one thing you want on line 1 – 1 and 3 – of course, is good, solid, honest pain.

Now, somebody's going to come along and tell you sometime that it is a somatic. Of course a somatic covers pain and sensation, and that a somatic is a somatic, and they'll say they have pains – when as a matter of fact they mean they have pressures.

You don't get confused about this. You have to make this very definitive. You say they have a pressure on the side, so they tell you they have a somatic, and then you think they said a pain. You ask them, "Well, was it a pain?"

And they will say, "Yes it's a heavy pressure." But they maybe not say, "It's a heavy pressure." See, they – "Oh yes, I have a pain in my side." They mean it's some kind of a pressure, don't you see. So you have to describe what you mean by pain.

"Well, does it feel the same way if you took a knife and pushed it into your side and twisted it around a bit? It would be painful." "Oh no, nothing like that," you'll hear a pc every once in a while, you know. "If you stuck a pin through your finger is that the way it would feel?"

"Oh well, no, nothing like that. There's just a little solid pressure there," something like that, you know. Because pain is pain. There is no substitute. Pain – it hurts. It isn't uncomfortable – it hurts! And that's what we mean by "pain".

Now, the real goal gives pain on line 1, and a little pain on line 3. Line 3 sometimes mixes it up with pain and sensation, see, because it's a harder closure, see. Because line 3 of course, is opposing the opposition, so it gets the sensation of the opposition, and so forth. It can get more mixed up, see. So it's not a reliable test.

And line 4 – since line 4 is simply a covert opposition of some kind or another – sometimes has some pain mixed up in it as well as sensation. Whereas it's basically and ordinarily sensation on line 4, it sometimes can get a little pain mixed up into it. The guy gets a feeling of heavy pressure with a little *zzst* that goes down the front of it that hurts, see. Well, it's a mixup, don't you see.

So therefore, lines 3 and 4 on listing are not reliable as indicators at all and shouldn't be taken to heart – unless down toward the end of the line the guy insists on getting sensation all the time and forever, don't you see – sensation is continuous, and that sort of thing – on line 3 for instance. Well, that would be very unusual. It should become more and more

predominately painful when anything occurs there. So it comes back to the sole indicators, which are lines 1 and 2. And line 1 has got to have pain in it – period. Must not have sen in it.

But when you first start to patch up a goal that has been misrun, you're liable to get some sen coming off of it or something like that because it's been too invalidated and then it will come into pain, don't you see? You might get a little sen off of line 1 before you got any pain off of line 1, but don't count on it.

And line 2 shouldn't have any pain in it at all, but occasionally on running items down the line the pc gets his items mixed up. The items that should be on list 2 are occurring on list 1 and vice versa.

You say, "Who or what would try to catch catfish?" Or "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" Let's get the proper goals here. And you say, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?"

And he says, "A fish and game warden." You say, "Well good, thank you. Who or what – you know, don't challenge the pc's answer – and you'd say, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?" And he says, "A catfish fisherman." It all seems sensible to him.

Well, you recognize what is happening there. The closure is so tight, the pc is all mixed up and he's liable to get some sensation and some pain misplaced on these lines once in a while. But your standard, run of the mill action is pain, and that is the test by which you guide by. That is one of the basic tests. As you go running down the line you say, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?"

"Ouch."

"Who or what would not – would oppose catching catfish?"

"Mmmmm, ohohohoh," see. Why are you swimming, auditor? "Who or what would retard the opposition to catching catfish?" And it's... "Mmmm, ouch!" see.

And "Who or what would pull you back from catching catfish?" would be "Mmmm, ick." That's the way these things fit. You get it? (However the wording of the lines goes.)

Now, finding the goal originally – if you are doing a very good job, an excellent job, if you are right there, right in there pitching – in other words if your Model Session and your auditor presence is good, and if by some accident you can read the E-Meter, what's going to happen? Every goal you find on the pc's goals list that has any sensation or pain in it by reason of being touched and read on the list will be clean as a whistle by the time you leave it.

We're going down the list, we're going down the list, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, see, and we've got this goal "To be a waterbuck," see. And we've got this goal "To be a waterbuck," and the guy goes "*whaag*," and so forth.

And one of the things you're not doing right now that you certainly had better do – two things:

A goal that actually bangs all by itself, you put a circle around the X. See? Cross it out, but put a circle around it – because you could use that data various ways. In other words, that means it fired all by itself when I got it all cleaned up. When I got it all cleaned up it fired all by itself – and then went null, of course – but it did fire all by itself. Put a circle around the X. That’s just for future reference, and you can very often use that.

And get the pc to tell you when he has pn and when he has sen, and put it down.

Now, those two things you really ought to do.

I used the fact of what goals were rock slamming the other day to plot out what the pc had overts on to run O/W on to turn off a dirty needle, and it’s now off. That’s pretty slippery, isn’t it? I expect you to do that as a matter of routine action, but I just – I found there were about four or five goals that rock slammed. I went down through the line and I figured out, by asking a few little test questions of the pc, what the pc had overts on that was giving him a dirty needle all the time, and just ran O/W on that. And bang – that was the end of the rock slamming needle. Quite interesting. Pc had to be pretty well in-session before that could have occurred.

But there was the use, see, of notations on a goals list. Let us say a rather unusual expedient, but this was also rather unusual to have a half-a-dial rock slam, see. I had to get it off in order to get anyplace. So I just decided to take it all off in a batch, and I made this test. Took the – took about five goals that had rock slammed and I had noted down on the borders. After they went out I’d noted that when I hit these goals they rock slammed, added them up and said it must be to this thing, asked a couple of questions, checked it out, ran O/W on that and that was the end of the dirty needle. It was just an experimental action, but it worked beautifully.

And this other one, of course, you can figure out which way the pc is going – and you can figure out whether you’ve got a goal or not by going back and looking at those circled X’s. Just look at them, and they had pn, circled X – “pn” and then X with a circle on it. It banged all by itself – goals line, see. After we cleaned it all up, it had one bang in it, and it had pain on it.

Now, we see what kind of a goal that was. It’s a hunting-type goal – “I want to get at men, men, men,” you know, something like that goal – something like that see-hunting-type goal. Outflowing, hunting-type goal, see.

The next one that stayed in madly, “I want to shove it down their throats and make it stick!” – pn, circle. And the goal we had found is “To kill them all, damn them – to kill them all,” you see.

And there’s one in here, “To be a sweet and peaceful child.” It fired once, but it had “sen” after it. Ah, we see where this pc is built, don’t we? We can do an analysis of it and it safeguards us from listing an opposition goal as the pc’s goal.

Obviously “To kill them all, damn them, to kill them all,” – right in keeping with the rest of the goals that produced pain and stayed in – pc’s goal, see. Of course we don’t know

that for sure after we've listed it for a while, but we can pretty well guarantee it on that spot check. See the use of that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Yeah, you've got to be slippery. You've got to outguess the pc. If left to his own devices, you understand, the pc would give you the wrong goal, the opposition goal – would insist that you check it out. I never saw the like of it. PCs will sit there and they'll pick some favorite goal, you know – “To wear tall hats in court,” you know. They think, “My, that's a nice goal!” you know. For some reason or other, they're enamored of this goal. Do you know that twenty-five percent of the pcs will try to do this, but your Model Session is so rigged today that they can't. If you didn't have Model Session the way it was today, twenty-five percent of your pcs would. They'd lift their finger every time you saw that. “To wear tall hats in court.” They can get it pretty well timed too. They know at what point to lift their finger off to give you an instant read, you see.

Another one is to go into a convulsion. They sell you the goal by going into a convulsion. You know I just never will take a goal that will throw a pc into a convulsion anymore. I just won't.

Mary Sue has a system. She says, “Sit back there and don't you move. Now, I'm going to read the goal.” It's a very effective system too, and she can check the thing out.

But you get pcs going into a writhing convulsion or something every time you read the goal “To put out the devil's eyes,” you see. And they love that goal – and they'll actually knowingly go into a convulsion, knowing you can't check out the goal. They are selling that goal, man. They'll just sell that goal and sell that goal. *Wow!*

Well, people commit suicide. We just had a notable example tonight. Any one of you girls could have done very well with that mock-up that knocked itself off in Hollywood in the last day or so. I'm sure that she would have thought that was quite nice. Here she is going and knocking herself off, you know. The body, herself, see. She didn't have any use for it, why didn't she put an ad in the paper?

Well, she's probably crying in some maternity ward right now – and somebody will be saying, “Well give her a sedative.” Yeah. But they will, they'll just commit suicide, just like that. Got everything to live for – there's the auditor, good auditor, ready to audit him, everything else and then they have got to sell you this corny goal.

They get very anxious, you know – they've got to have a goal, they've got to have the goal, they've got to have the goal! *Hehh!* They've just got to have one regardless – any old goal. So, ping! – off goes the finger! Ping! – off goes the finger. Ping! – off goes the finger. Convulsions and so forth. You'd be amazed what we've seen around here on that. It's absolutely fantastic. It's twenty-five percent of the pcs. That's no small percentage, and they'll do it! And an auditor who will buy a pc's goal is not only a fool, he's practically a murderer.

And yet, man, the sales talk you will get. Why down at the car agency they don't know 'arf "Well, it's always been my goal, to catch catfish. It always has been my goal. I, you know, studied fishing when I was in college," and so forth, "but I couldn't pass any of the courses." See they've learned all of the rules on which goals are goals. "I was never any good at it. It's always been some – it's always given me a terrible headache every time I go down by the river banks," you know.

And look at all the other similar goals in there! Look at the other similar goals to this, and so forth. "To be a bank teller" – you see, similar goal. Sales talk, sales talk, sales talk, sales talk. It's when it gets that hot you have to pull this Suggest as Assert – when you are checking them out. And you get a marvelous parade of these goals going by.

Well, anyway – you've got to get the pc's right goal, and you can't be overwhelmed by a bunch of wrong goals. And one of the little incidental tests is: You tell the pc, "Every time you feel dizzy or faint, or something like that, you tell me."

And you've got to tell him that every few goals. He'll forget it, you know.

You've got to ask him, and you ask him if he's had any pains or sensations, you see, and then tell him, "Well, when you get any, you want to speak right up and tell me," you see. He'll keep forgetting it. They eventually will groove in so they will tell you. But you can mark those down, and then by comparing that to the very few goals that stay in – on nulling by mid ruds – you can sort the pc's goal out and know whether you are running the right goal or not before you start listing it. All right, that's a sorting technique.

Now, this is what I wanted to tell you – that you mustn't go *by* one of those goals and leave a somatic on it, whether it's pain or sensation. You mustn't, mustn't do that! In other words you say to this person, "To catch catfish," and he has a horrible pain in his mouth. And he says, "dit." Doesn't say anything to you about it, and you clean off the suppressions and the invalidations, the suggestions, the fails to reveal and the mistakes, and hit it, ask the suppression. You don't see anything on there.

Now, listen there's another test. If you are very alert, the pc has been telling you when he had pains and if there is anything remaining of that pain, you've got a goal behind you which is hung up. And after a while the goals list gets jammy.

Now, what I am telling you is this – that goals nulling by mid ruds turns out to be a *fantastically* therapeutic action. It isn't just sitting there grinding away. Now, if you know this other fact, the pc just comes up shining – if you know this other fact – that you *mustn't leave sensation or pain of any kind on the pc when you leave the goal*. If that goal turned it on, you've got to get all the invalidations and everything else off of it.

It isn't really as vigorous as it sounds. It only takes you a few minutes to do this. I mean, you just do it, just in the normal course of human events, or inhuman events. Just straight drill. But one of the things that you should make sure of is if a pain came on when you read that goal, *that all of those somatics are gone at the time you leave it*. The somatic,

you might say, goes slightly deeper than the meter, so you've got to check. Now, you get to listening to this pc – he says, “To catch catfish,” he gets a pain in his mouth.

And you get the invalidations, and you get the suggestions, the failures to reveal and mistakes – just normal, just like you are doing it – you don't have to push for anything else off of this thing. You read it and get the suppressions, and it doesn't read. He's still got a pain down here in his stomach somewhere.

So if a pain came on, you go back and you find out there's a little piece, little, tiny, old piece of an invalidation stuck in there that you didn't get off.

See you didn't ask the invalidation question again. See, you thought you got invalidations cleaned up, but remember you took some other things off. Then when you – invalidation was still a tiny little bit hot. In the normal course of finding a goal it wouldn't be enough to destroy a goal perhaps or keep a goal from reading – but it's enough to keep the somatic in.

So don't go so careful you drive your pc berserk and only get six done in three hours of auditing, but just be careful that when sensations and somatics come on, that you keep taking off your suppressions, invalidations, suggestions, failures to reveal and mistakes. And if they don't all come off, get curious about this, you know. Use another word like asserted, evaluate, you know, it's almost like a final checkout, only you don't go into a big Prepcheck. You'd be surprised what facility you can develop just to knock off that last little sticking piece, you see.

Well, you can go by one of these things like this, and you say, “To catch catfish,” and the pc goes “mmmp.” That's it, that's it. You say, “Has this goal been suppressed?” And you don't get much of a response on it. And you go on, and pc had a somatic at the beginning of this goal. Well, if you're having trouble cleaning this, ask him the kingpin question: “Any somatics been suppressed on this goal?”

Because what happened is you said, “To catch catfish” and the pc put on every brake in the bank on the somatics. And somehow or another it doesn't cross in his mind. And if you didn't know this, you would go right on down the line, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, and you'd leave that goal hung, and the accumulated hanging up of four or five such goals then leaves the pc rather uncomfortable by session end. And he shouldn't be uncomfortable by session end!

If you do goals nulling by mid ruds properly, your pc is just as smooth as silk – much better at the end of a session than at the beginning.

Now, if you don't do this – and one other factor added, which is the reassurance factor – if you don't do this, your pc is going to get nervy, anxious, upset. Only one other thing can make him that upset, and that's to go by his goal and not find it. *Ooohh* God! You remember Henny Penny and the sky was falling, you know? That was *thyeh!* That's purely a fairy tale compared to a pc whose goal has been passed on the list! His goal was “To catch catfish,” and it's back there now about three goals, and he suddenly starts waking up. “Are you sure you

can read the E-Meter? Yes, well, I have quite a pain in my side here. Why don't you hear what I am telling you? The room is much too hot."

Here we go, you know, you can't keep the session together, you can't keep anything, it'd just go to pieces. You pull missed withholds, you pull more missed withholds. It doesn't do any good – the missed withhold is the goal. It gives all the responses with exclamation point of missed withholds. All of them occur right at that point, except he might not wake up for a half a page, see. If he'd just wake up that instant that you tried to leave it, or something like that, but they don't. It goes by, and when it's well by, the pc says, "Hey, where are we going? Where are we going?" He gets a set of Dunlap tires, you know, puts skid marks on the auditing track about a hundred and fifty yards long. He isn't going anyplace.

Poor auditor. And by the way, this is complicated by the fact that pcs can also act that way *without* their goal, but not quite so much. It's a matter of degree if you are leaving somatics on the goals as you go by. Then the pc starts getting nervy.

You went by one, "To be a tiger," and he went "Ooooh." Then you went on to the next one, "To eat waterbuck." He's still going "Ooooh." He never got out of the tiger deal, see. He's still there; he's still got sensation on this thing.

If you picked up – now hear this real well – if you picked up all the invalidation that you would normally get in a session – not backtrack or anything – all the invalidation, all of the suggestion, all of the "failed to reveal," and all the "mistake been made," and all the suppress – if those things were all picked up – no somatic or sensation would be left on any goal contacted.

Now, add that in to the other side of this which is, if a goal has been found that is a wrong goal, even though it has been listed, and upset the pc, God help us, if you take all of the suppressions, invalidations, fails to reveal, you see, and mistakes off of that wrong goal, your pc will come back to battery. Get them all off. Man, you really have to get in there and sweat. It isn't that it takes a long time to do, it's just that it takes an accurate look over. You have to get them all off; why, the pc will come right back to battery.

There he was with two feet in the grave and both of his hands on banana peels, and he'll come right back out – and he'll come right back out. It's quite remarkable.

Now, if a pc has had several wrong goals found on him, one after the other, take them in sequence. Take every goal that has been found on you. Not found and proved out, see? Every goal that has been found on you, like goals that have been suspected and goals that you had to have checked out the next day but they didn't check out. You get what I mean now by every goal found on the pc? Whether found and proved, or just, you know, just found. And you can even add those he was "absolutely sure were his goal," see. And just make a list of those things – just write them all down in order of sequence as they happened, see. Clean up each one with nulling by mid ruds. Pc will feel wonderful. There will be no liability to having found wrong goals. That's very well worth knowing, isn't it? That's patch-up.

Now, that doesn't mean that you can do a careless job of goals finding or a careless job of listing just because you can patch it up, because the patch-up is never quite as good as the original article. It's something like a rebuilt – a rebuilt typewriter, don't you see, or a rehabilitated girl. They are never quite the same, sleek Condition as the original article, but it permits you to go on and find the right one without any consequences. Got the idea?

You – well you see it yourself. You list five thousand items on a wrong goal, and wow! Well, there actually would be no reason whatsoever to take the time necessary, you see, to erase every single, slightest thing they had ever done or said in listing.

You'd clean the goal up is what you'd do, clean it up so it's slick as a whistle and you can't get it to fire, you can't get any of the other things to fire and you can't get a couple of others to fire as I just gave them to you. Can't get anything to move now and it all appears fairly clean. That's good enough – now you can go on and find yourself a new goal.

Don't say the pc won't – he won't feel bad about it, but he'll look a little seedy around the edges if you've gone that far. You understand? Don't expect him to come out clear and shining. If I left you the idea that they would come out into a cleared state, then we would have a new method of clearing. You just find a wrong goal on the pc, list it and then clean it up. No, there is no substitute for doing it right in the first place.

Your actions here in doing that – I want you to know this real well – in doing these drills on this bulletin of August 1st, you've got two things that if you want to keep a pc really shining you must do: is polish up any goal that has been found, or is being found, or anything else. In other words get the sensation, somatics off any goal as you go down the list, see. Or if you are picking up a pc who has had the wrong goal found on him, then get every wrong goal that was found on the pc and clean all those things up, see. Cleaning up the goals – that all comes under the heading of it. And if you go down the nulling list, and you go on down the nulling list, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, on through – clean up every one you go by.

Don't say, "Oh well, to wrap peppermint candy around lampposts in Chicago, there's no sense in cleaning that up. Obviously isn't the pc's goal, *ha-ha-ha-ha-ha*," you know. "To wrap peppermint candy around the lamppost in Chicago. Thank you. Has that goal been suppressed? Thank you, thank you very much." Next goal, you know.

You'll find yourself doing that sometime late at night. No, be alert. Even though it's a PT thing, there might have been a nice somatic on it, or there might have been some sensation on it that might be in. What the hell is he doing putting down a present time goal like that if it isn't on the goals chain. Don't you see?

Clean it up just as carefully as you would clean up – as though it were the right goal. Now, you treat every one of these goals of course then – just in summation of that – treat every single one of these goals as though it is *the* goal. They are all *the* goal. The moment you get onto them, it is the goal until proven otherwise.

And the other one is the reassurance factor. And that is the other thing. That isn't necessarily the two main things in auditing these things but these are the two things that will

get you in most trouble. By omitting the reassurance factor. You've never heard of it before; it's time you did. A pc needs some pats on the back when he's going over the jumps on this. "Heeeyyy, wh-wh-where-where-where's his goal, you know, where is it, you know?" And he thinks of terrible situations and the horrible things that are going to happen, you know, and the terrible awfulnesses of it all if he doesn't find his goal, or supposing it's behind him. Worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry – see.

Well, you best counter this with reassurance. Do a perfect job of auditing, but don't sit there like a wooden image with never a pat on the back for the pc. Tell him once in a while, "Well take it easy. I'm cleaning each one up. Now, as a matter of fact, I overclean and that is the reason why you are a little bit upset. I sometimes clean a clean on you just to make sure. That – that's all right, I'm just – everything is going along fine, and you are doing fine. We've got a long way to go now. You just keep telling me when you have somatics, and you sit there comfortably, and when you get dizziness or sensation you tell me, too. Everything's going to be fine." Got the idea?

You make that pervade your goals-finding sessions and by keeping them all clean as you go by them and reassuring the pc – not falsely, it's perfectly factual – he'll be all right. Why, you'll have much easier, much happier sessions. Those are the two primary things.

Now, there are several secondary things to all these things, and there are other things of importance on this, and I actually haven't really begun to fire on the subject of goals listing so we'll have to continue into the second lecture.

Thank you.

Thank you. Take a break.