3GA LISTING, PART II

A lecture given on
27 September 1962

All right. This is lecture two, September what? Twenty-six?

Audience: 27.

Twenty-seventh. You got a day ahead of me. Holy Cats! Here I've been in Wednesday all the time, and you're in Thursday. September, 27, AD 12. And this is lecture number two, and it continues on the subject of listing.

The rules of listing. The rules of listing consist of good Model Session, simple auditing, minimum. two-way comm, rapid writing, rapid writing, minimal paper-shuffling, get the goal to fire before you list. Goal no fire: no list. And in addition to all that, be alert for free needles on lines, and when some line has gone free needle, you drop the number of items to be listed on it.

You still include it in the lineup, to make sure that it doesn't, till you're absolutely convinced that it's going to stay that way, and then you can drop it out. But that's adventurous. You just minimize the number of items. You are listing right now – probably this number will change, this number I'm about to give you will alter – forty lines is the current number of lines being listed on a goal, and those are all listed to free needle. And the number of items you write on a line is four, and you include it in the auditing command.

You say, "Give me four items for the line, 'Who or what would want to catch catfish?' " And you take your four items. And if the pc forgets the auditing command, you can repeat it for him. But you omit the "give me four items." You can say, "The line was..." "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" is the way you repeat it, okay?

Now, that's total standardization. You don't want five, you don't want three. Now, after a line has gone free – and this is subject to amendment on experience – after a line has gone free, you want just *one.* If it's sitting there with a free needle, it's been sitting there with free needle, you can cut down the number of items listed. And you say, "Give me *an* item!'

And you get one item for it. That at least keeps the balance. Otherwise that thing is liable to jam out, don't you see? "Who or what would want to catch catfish?"

Now, this permits you to catch up old lines, because some lines have been listed a lot longer than others. Don't you see? Because somebody has been listed on four lines or sixteen lines, and therefore, those lines would wind up as being overlisted. They're liable to go Clear,

or free needle, before the other lines. There's a possibility of this happening. So this four and one proposition permits those things to catch up.

Now, however many lines are listed is not very important, and exactly how you handle items after a needle has gone free does not invalidate the data I'm giving you. That's susceptible to amendation. But the facts are these. That you don't want to overlist a free needle. That is one of the rules. Don't overlist a free needle. This person is very, very free, and you overlist it, and you're going to run into the possibility of jamming it all up again. Because the pc is having to create answers, and you have entered in on an area called Creative Processing. And it's not permitted these days.

You see how that would happen? All right. Now, a pc looks like he's dreaming up the lines, and thinking them up, and creating them – actually not. They're dealt to him like a stack of cards. He's just dealing out the GPM. He's not inventing anything until he gets to a free needle. And then to have an item he'll have to dream up an item, unless he repeats an item. So you mustn't overlist free needle lines.

Now, the next thing is, is what is a free needle? Well, a free needle is best described as a free needle. Somebody – this is also – you're going to have a happy time with this; more power to you. I can see you now, standing there, somewhat overwrought, having to answer off the bat three people in a co-audit, all of whom are asking you, "But what is (does) a free needle look like?" And they show you proudly a stage four needle, you see.

They say – the other one – another one is saying, "Is a free needle a quarter of an inch wide, or a half an inch wide?" see. "Is it a free needle at sensitivity 16 or sensitivity l?" "Is it a. . ."

And the answer to that is the same answer I'm going to give you. When you see one, you will know one. I've never had anybody fail to look at a free needle that didn't recognize it as a free needle. It suddenly has become unattached to anything. The needle apparently is not connected to the meter or the pc or anything. It's just sitting there floating. And it has an odd, floating characteristic, that has nothing to do with falling or rising. It floats up the dial and it floats down the dial. The pc will be somewhere in the vicinity of Clear read, depending on the accuracy of your meter.

Do you know that after you've carefully set up a meter, during the process of a session, the discharge of batteries, the warmth of it, the heating of the cans, a number of other things, can change the position of the Clear read? Did you know that? So the way you handle a test, for whether somebody is sitting at Clear, is not to take the meter which you tuned up this morning, and test the pc with it this afternoon. You got that? You have to set it up instantly before the test, and the meter has to be warm. Okay?

If there's any doubt about it at all, have an electrician get you five thousand ohms, and twelve thousand five hundred ohms, and put them on a couple of clips. They're resistors. And

get a pair of resistors. You hook those between the cans, and it's very simple. You get two resistors and just – they've got little clips on the end of them, you just hook one end to one can and one end to the other can, keep the cans apart, and your meter should come exactly to the Clear read female and the Clear read male. Okay? Should come right on. In other words, you can tune up a meter even if it were repaired by somebody and its calibration thrown out. And you could know your meter sat someplace else. Don't you see?

But actually, the resistors can be changed inside this by the trim knob. That's why the Mark IV and later designs will be found to be built with a variable resistance inside the meter. Meters can be changed, meters can be dropped. You can suddenly start using a new type of battery or something of the sort in a meter, and have some other situation set in, don't you see? Something can happen to your meter so that it is no longer accurate.

But as far as exactly reading on the Clear read, you should know that five thousand ohms and twelve thousand five hundred ohms is standardized only on fifteen people. That's the original standardization. And that wasn't a very good standardization, don't you see? It was accurate, it was accurate, and it has held amazingly accurate. But what is amazing about it, is that it has held accurate. Do you see that? What's amazing about it, is that they do go to five thousand ohms for a female and twelve thousand five hundred ohms for a male. I mean, that's rather fantastic when you come to think about it.

How come? You'd think all thetans were built on the same battery circuits, you know. Actually, it's just the residual resistance of the body itself, and it's not so amazing, because a body is built against certain potentials and actions – electrical potentials. And a body does not depend for its electrical potentials upon the mass of the body.

You're going to get this little four-foot-eight little girl midget, see. Here's this four-foot-eight little girl, she's a very petite package. And here's this girl who has been one of the chorus, she's six-foot-four, see. And the little four-foot-eight girl, why, she weighs upwards to seventy-nine pounds wringing wet, you see. And here is this beautiful chorus-line girl, and she's six-foot-four, you see, and built like an Amazon, see. And she weighs something on the order of two hundred and ten pounds, you see. But because these are girls, they're both five thousand ohms. Gets me you know. In other words, this is inserted amongst the same set of anchor points, you might say. It's this – this – anchor points are the similarity, not the mass of the body. All right. That's beside the point.

How accurate this is, to some slight degree, remains to be seen, see. How dead-on this is remains to be seen. I have to give you that word of warning because I tell you what the calibration was based on, see. Based on only fifteen people. All right. And on an American 1957 meter. Something to know, isn't it?

And I tuned up its resistances afterwards, and I said that's what they are. And the electronics boy, Scientologist, there working in the organization went down immediately and

... You know, it some – it's something like carrying the measurement on a piece of string. You've done it yourself. You've taken a piece of string at one end of the garden, you know, and carried it over to the other end of the garden to find out if you could get the chair through the gate, or something, you know. You've done things like this. Well, that's – that's about the accuracy of it, see. He took the piece of string, you know, down to the electronics workbench and measured it. Actually carried the meter down, and measured its ohmage.

Now, that was the score on these things. Now, the basic datum on which this is taken is interesting. It's the United States Army meter resistance, or electrical resistance of a dead body. And they claim it is ten thousand ohms approximately, with great differences. They never noticed, see. They averaged this amongst men and women corpses. Get the idea? That's the only other known datum on this.

Now, if you want to go down to a mortuary sometime with a volt meter, why, more power to you. And if you do, for heaven's sakes send me the data. They got some stiffs down here and so forth. There are three white men, a Mexican, a Negro and a Chinese, you know? And their ohmage is so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so. Good. I´d be very happy to have the data. You see, the data's quite scarce. Very scarce.

Now, just with that word of warning, put your reliance on the free needle.

Now, you're going to get somewhere near, on your meter, the "M" for males, and the "F" for females. But as long as it's in that range, don't quibble about it too much. But let me tell you, that if men are reading at 2.0 with a free needle, and women are reading at 3.0 with a free needle, I don't know what's reading with the free needle, but it's not the pc. See, if it's within a tenth, within a quarter, something like that, of male or female read, fine, see. That's fine. Don't argue with that too much, see. But a whole division, or a swap-around that way, no, I – that's too far out.

Now, as far as somebody reading with a free needle at 5.0 – nup, nup, nup. Ain't never happened, ain't never gonna happen. When they get up to 5.0, man, there is something wrong! When somebody's reading at 4.5 and 5.0 constantly, and never comes down from 4.5 and 5.0, all tone arm motion is somewhere in the vicinity of 5.0, like 4.75 to 5.25, see, you've got something wrong. That we have learned. That is just experiential, that is absolutely, completely, empirical data. Just by observation.

Somebody's listing, and they never move off 5.0, and one session they're at 5.25, and the next session they're at 4.75, and next session they're at 5.0, and they just – 5.0 and 4.5 and 5.5 and 5.0, and ... Well, you better look into that, man, because that's one of the warning signs. That's one of the warning signs. That's wrong goal, wrong auditor, you know.

Now, these things are important to you, because they are the criteria by which you're making a Clear. It isn't whether or not the pc can spring over the back fence with one leap, see. Or whether he can now do a hundred and seventy-five handstands, whereby yesterday he

could only do one, and collapse, you see. That has nothing to do with it. That is spectacular, but it's not data. Clear is registered on a meter. Not on a pc. Because, boy, can you be fooled.

Somebody can go into some tearing manic, you know. Man! They've never been able to lift pianos before, and they got one in each hand, you know? There they are! And you say, "Well! Fine! He's Clear!" Yeah, he's Clear, till that valence called Hercules suddenly slips into another part of the bank, you see. That was always the trouble with it, anyhow. It was never there when it was needed, long enough.

No, it's not the conduct of the pc that makes a Clear, see, never. Now, the only use – the only thing you use the pc for is to find out if the pc is looking worse. Now, how much worse is worse? Well, I could again see you standing in that lecture room with eighteen standing around you, saying, "Well, the pc looks worse." And they all think, how much worse is worse, see. "How much worse is worse? Is worse worse than worse, or is worse worse than worse?" Well, worse is how the pc looks when they're being audited on wrong goals or by the wrong auditor. That's – that's what worse is. That's how the pc looks.

Frankly, it is basically a question of how old they look. There's another factor which is interesting. It's a glowingness of the skin. When a person is going wrong way to in goals finding or Prepchecking, and it's all getting very weird and rough and mean, or they're being audited on a wrong goal, their skin goes dull, very dull, extremely dull. So much so, that I can usually tell at a glance just about where somebody is in processing and how well the processing is going.

Because it's the youthness of the skin. And after they've been audited properly, you'll find that they glow. The skin has a glow to it. Has nothing

anything to do with color, it's just that the skin glows. And the skin doesn't glow, they are not making good progress. Skin does glow, why, they're making good progress. Skin was glowing yesterday, isn't glowing today, well they're having a bad day.

Skin was glowing on Monday, but on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, you in observing them, decide that they're looking older, and look less glowy, and less glowy, there is something wrong. You understand? They'll get less glowy for a period, like a day, or two sessions, or something like that, and more glowy. But consistent ungloviness, we don't tolerate. Got it? It's – you might call it the firefly effect.

But you'd be amazed. Now, the funny part of it is, is their physiological structure changes in clearing, and they look older, and they look worse, and they – their bones go worse. Body mass and – can be measured on scales. But these other things aren't as measurable as that. Their body mass will ordinarily lessen on proper auditing on the right goal. It'll streamline down. And it will increase, definitely, on the wrong goal. And will not decrease on bad auditing. Not decrease on bad auditing.

Won't necessarily increase on bad auditing, but it could. But not necessarily. On a wrong goal, it increases fantastically! Zoom! You're liable to have him put on two, three stone – twenty-eight, forty-two pounds, to Americans. I didn't get this "stone" stuff myself until a short time ago. They didn't have any weights over here, they had to use stones. That's ...

Anyway, weight goes up on wrong goal and doesn't decrease on wrong auditing. That's just a casual mark, not of any vast importance. Might be of some interest to you. This glow principle is very important. People run on wrong goals unglow fast. The tides of night sweep across the psyche.

Now, physiological facial structure can alter, too. I've seen jaws, jawbones decrease in size, increase in size, faces fill out, so on. Quite a common thing is for the face to start sinking under the wrong goal or bad auditing. The face gets sinking – it starts sinking in. Gets flatter. And starts to fill out on good auditing and the right goal. The shape comes forward.

All of these are various manifestations. And you'll get a little experienced on this, keeping your weather eye peeled. And one fine day, why, you get to the point where you can just – actually just look at a case and know whether it's running right or not, you know. Bang! Just like that.

You say, "Well, that isn't so good."

You would ask the auditor, "Which lines is the pc ARC broke on?"

And the auditor would say, "How did you know?" you know.

You'd say to the pc, "Well, are you very dizzy today?"

"Oh, how did you know?"

The room is going round and round and round, you see. Wrong, suppressive auditing. Other things, see?

Now, if the goal is found but the pc is running wrong in listing, you have these items that could be in error. It could be one of these: One, the goal could be wrong. You never really trust a goal till it's been listed a bit. Yeah, all the other signs are fine, and the wrong goal won't keep on firing, and a lot of other things, but just for your own peace of mind, why, the goal is found and proven when it's been checked out by a – found by the – an auditor, checked out by another auditor, *and* listed a bit. How much is a bit? I can see you now, in the lecture room ... Why should I dream up figures for these things, you see. They depend basically on observation and judgment. Trying to communicate them to you with a bunch of invented facts would, Im afraid, serve no purpose at all.

Now, these are quite correct, these six things. Goal could be wrong; (2) lines could be wrong; (3) auditor has not cleared goal by "in auditing, on the goal. . ." Tiger Drill – and gotten goal reading, see. Didn't get the goal firing – number three; (4) rudiments are out. I think you

possibly have heard of rudiments being out in sessions. That includes, of course, missed with-holds. Bulletin May the 3rd, 1962; (5) pc protesting about listing a line or listing lines – listing and lines. Pc's saying, *"Whra-whra-whra-ne-wra – I don't need these lists – ah-tha-wrah-tha-nah."* Something wrong; and (6) the consequences of being cleared. And that you haven't paid enough attention to.

That's a very, very interesting one, however. Pcs have been known not to put their goals on a list, because they were so frightened of becoming cleared. What happens to you when you become cleared? *Oooh, you* turn into solid glass, of course, and then put on display in the Metropolitan Museum. They know what happens to you if you get Clear. They – of all of the aberrated balderdash and nonsense you ever want to listen to.

Well, get somebody who has been – who has got "Nothing" confused with having been imprisoned. You know, they got a complete identification. Remember people get identifications. You've heard of A=A=A=A. Well, it's never more present than in the vicinity of the goal – never more present.

And they get some wild identification of some kind or another and they want to be cleared, but when you come right down to asking them for their goal, you'll have a person here or there who will suddenly – you can hear the squeal of the brakes, you know? You can see the furrows in the roadway as the heels dig in. And they'll have various interesting things go wrong. Odd part of it is, this is not the thetan operating, see. They got a valence, and it's having a ball! And of course the keynote of any valence is survival. That is the common denominator of valences. And things that valences do to perpetuate themselves is fantastic! And one of the things that they do, is resist clearing.

You see all the time the pc was living that life he was trying to live, wasn't he? He was trying to survive. Well, this valence is just the leftover shell of that life, which go on – goes on operating in the bank like a thinking being. Well, there it is, and its basic motivation is to survive. And all of a sudden the person gets the idea that something's going to happen to valences. You know? But as a valence, gets the idea that something is going to happen to valences, you got that?

This is very funny. As a thetan, the person is all the time cooperating with you to get Clear, see. But every once in a while in an auditing session, or something like that, particularly somebody who has a goal that is in the direction of good auditing, or something like that – a person with a goal, "to be a good auditor" – you know, let's say that was the basic purpose of the person, which it wouldn't be, you see – we get a "to be a good auditor" and then you get him shifted, and they're in a valence of a pc. And they aren't themselves as a pc, ever, you get the idea? Something weird like this going on. And they set up the awfullest commotion abo – sometimes about going Clear. And they stand back, and look at themselves and "Look at this silly mess I'm making. Now, what it is?"

You know, if you ever believe it, you almost crack the person up as a thetan. lf you really pay any real attention to this. You know, besides clearing it up. lf you should say, "Well, he doesn't want to get Clear," and so on, man! You'll see this as we go along the track here on Earth, you'll see this.

There's somebody bra – he's throwing brickbrats – bats, you know, and he's drawing cartoons of us, and he's raising hell with us, and so forth, and he's screaming in an awful fit. And if you really want to break his heart just tell him, "Well, we're not going to clear you." Maybe the very subject of the cartoons is "Getting Clear – that's terrible! They're making supermen! They're doing Germans' stuff ! And we're going to be invaded again, by men from Mars!" and any kind of idiocy, see.

And you just say to the fellow, "Well, we're not going to clear you." He'll really go to pieces. This is the most fantastic thing you ever wanted to see. And if you Q-and-A with this, and if you get a pc actually in there saying, "Oh, no, no, no! I – no, no – tha – da – listing lines is terrible!" and so on. Just finding trouble, see. The auditor's wrong and the lines are wrong and the goal is wrong and everything is wrong and you're wrong and the room is wrong and everything is wrong and you can't audit and so forth, and what did they teach you at Saint Hill anyhow, you know. On and on and on and on and on and on and so forth. This could be one of the things.

Well, you don't condemn the person, you simply audit it. Because if at any moment during all those protests, you were to say, "Well, all right then I won't," you should see their face sag. And a person will come right out of a session doing that who hasn't found his goal yet, or something, and write down lists for you and give them to you and foree them off on you and everything else, you know. This is the most fantastic phenomena that you ever wanted to witness, when you really see this in high bloom. And you never suspect it because the person is quite often quite cooperative while they've got their heels set. Covert. Only their cooperation will be quite real. But they've still got their heels set.

There's various ways of doing this. The simplest one of course is "What would be the consequences of my clearing you?" Remember it must be ". . . MY clearing you" or ". . . our clearing you." It is never "What's the consequences of going Clear?" That is a wrong auditing command. It's generally tied up with the person's valence, which is opposed to some valence that you are. Let's say you're a male auditor and it's a female pc and she hates men. And the consequences are not that of going Clear, but of being cleared by a man. She knows what that means. And this is basically what is at the bottom of it, see.

Going Clear gets associated in people's minds with being killed and exteriorizing from a dead body, which of course it isn't. See, being Cl – going Clear gets reactively associated with the idea of ceasing to exist. They very often will give you some of the silliest answers. Some of the answers you hear coming off of this, the person listening to them himself or herself doesn't believe them either. They just sound utterly balderdash. And it's a valence proposition

is what you're looking at.

Well, if the pc is stuck that thoroughly in that valence, that valence is oddly enough not going to list out. UM be the valence the pc doesn't see or the valence the pc sees last is the valence the pc is in most. Now, I call to your attention the old Reality Scale, and some of all of that data. See, it's the last one they see, is the one they're in the most, see.

My God, it'll kick up an awful fuss. And you're having trouble, trouble, trouble. Well, there's various reasons pcs can get ARC breaks in goals finding. We're not touching on those now. Although this consequences of being cleared does enter into goals finding. But it certainly enters into listing. And it enters into listing more than it does goals finding. Person might have sat there like a little wooden soldier and let you find their goal. And you start listing it, and this is another story. Because you're asking for valences, and the valences restimulate, and all of a sudden everything is blowing up and going to blooey, see. Yow!

"Oh, you mean to say, me as a soldier is going to get killed. Me as a mother is going to get killed. Me as a . . ." see, ". . . is going to get killed. I am being wiped out. I am being slaughtered," so forth.

Well, I don't know. Its exteriorizing them from a valence. They also restimulate, of course, death. And getting rid of a valence may restimulate the idea of exteriorization from a body. You see these various things, how they cross up. But they're just reactive and they have no basis in fact and they're nothing to slow you down. And if you don't clean it up, you of course have got somebody who is ashamed of being so ARC breaky. And you just hung the person with shame – shame, so therefore they suppress this, and the next moment you've got sen, sen, sen, in all directions if you let them stack it up, stack it up, stack it up. Okay?

Now, the – as I say the auditing command "What is – what would be the consequences of my clearing you?" "What would be the consequences of our clearing you?" whichever seems to fit the bill. And you run that. And how flat do you run it? Well, I can see you now, standing in that lecture hall ... Anyhow, let's go on.

Actually you never do patch – l'll give you a rule for that. You never do patch-up jobs longer than is necessary to get done what you were trying to do in the first place. Now, if you'd just had that when you were coming up the track – I hate to be critical – but if you'd just thrown that second goal away, you see, at the time that it ceased to be of any use to you. You'd – that is to say, in effecting the first goal – see, you're trying to effect the first goal so you get a second goal. And if you use this second goal longer than is necessary to get the first goal effected, why, then you've got your start of the bank. And auditing can actually approximate that little goofball situation there.

So, don't ever do anything longer than is necessary to get done what you are trying to do. You'll save more auditing time that way. That's a nice, crude rule of thumb, but it's awfully good. You're running O/W, and you're still getting needle ticks and actions when on

the question, but the person's needle is now smooth. And you keep on running O/W. Well, you're being a knucklehead, of course.

Similarly, any such thing as, "What would be the consequences of getting Clear?" you'd run that long enough to get items on the list smoothly and without trouble. Because of course it's just coming from a valence anyhow. And this process is not going to get rid of any valences. Trying to change the mind of a machine, a valence or a circuit is – underscore *this* – *impossible. Y*ou cannot change the mind of a valence or a machine or a circuit. It's not possible.

You can submerge it, you can suppress it, you can wreck it, by making it inactive. You know, hit it – you can hit the steam engine hard enough on the valves and controls, and so forth, so it apparently won't run, but you can't change it into a petrol engine. You know, say, "Run like a petrol engine," and keep stoking up the boiler. Won't work. You can't change the mind of a valence.

That by the way goes back – to the first lecture I was telling you why thought, see. Well actually, the thought is encased in mass. And you can pull some of it out, and you can alter it in the mass, but in aggregate, the mass exists on and on and on and will continue to encase thought. You cant´t take the thought out of the mass, but you can take the mass off the thought at which moment the thought evaporates. I've lectured on that before. Quite interesting phenomena.

Yet you can list these consequences of being cleared out, providing the consequences of being cleared aren't causing suppression in the session. So you see you can deintensify a mind, but you cannot change a mind. So all you're doing with this is deintensifying the objections. Got that? When I'm saying % mind" you realize I refer to the mind of a valence or the mind of a circuit. These are little minds that guys have stuck around their own mind, the mind majeur, and I was referring to the mind mineur.

All right. Somebody sooner or later though, is going to take that out of context and say, "Well, Ron says you can't change anybody's mind."

Now, that's an easy one, and you wouldn't have any real trouble with getting this. Providing you *do* it. The reason I'm giving you so much talk on this, is it keeps getting lost.

Because the truth is that the pc actually wants to be Clear, would do *anything* to get Clear. That these objections are so much of a lie and are so aberrated and the pc *knows* they are aberrated that you very often ignore them. By tacit and common consent. So this is one of the things you must *do* in listing. Let's find out – if we're having a hard time finding a goal and certainly if we're having a hard time listing – find out what are the consequences of "our clearing you" or "my clearing you." What are the consequences of it?

See, the goal-finding auditor actually was just finding something. But the listing auditor is clearing somebody. See, he couldn't do it if he didn't (find) the goal, and the goal is the

important part of it. But the clearing will not take place unless the listing is done, don't you see?

So the consequences of being Clear are very, very important to the listing auditor. You'll see that a tremendous number of cases go right down sometimes to the last two days before all lines go free. And they just go to *pieces,* man! Oh! They're up all night, and they come in, there's circles under their eyes, that go clear down to their chin.

"What's the matter?"

"Oh, well, heh-heh. Heh-heh heh-heh-heh-heh. Why don't we just knock all this off now?"

And if you've run very bad sessions you don't have the pc at all, you have a telegram from Edinburgh – they're still heading north.

It'll just be some valence that's very, very reactive and the pc just going through a total dramatization on this silly valence. And its deintensify, and the pc will come back rather shamefacedly of themselves, and you start to list them again, the valence goes into full cry, and they try to dive out the window, see. This is the wildest thing you ever heard of.

It is the entity fighting for survival, is what this is. And why does it fight for survival? Because it wants anything? No, it's not even sentient. It is a reflective area which mirrors a lifetime in which the pc fought for survival as that thing. So therefore, a restimulation of it restimulates a fight for survival. That's the wildest thing you ever had anything to do with, is battling around with some stupid entity this way.

The pc: just as mild as milk and everything is fine on Monday. And on Tuesday: *"Nyah-lyah-yah-wrah-rah-rah-rah ... !"*

You say, "What's gone wrong?" Well, you can take the explosion out of it by pulling the missed withholds and getting the pc in-session, and that sort of thing. And you can also realize that once you've cleared the consequences of clearing, sometime down along the line of listing you may have to clear it again. Got that?

It isn't an aetion which you only undertake once. You may have to undertake it two, three times. Remember, as you list this person you're shifting this person into different parts of the bank. And you finally get this person into the part of the bank named "Space Opera-doll-body bin number 8647."

Now, at that particular section of the bank, life was tough. Life was hard. One was either the galactic police or one was this pirate commander or one was the rebel or one was the tough spaceman's crew or one was ... And everybody was practically unkillable, except that the weapons were very painful, and life is hard.

And you – this pcs been going along just fine. And you run into this where survival is

spelled with a capital "S," you see, and all of a sudden the pc's: "No! No! They don't know! They don't know about being Clear!"

They made a mistake. They think they better go back to Australia or something. Anyway. And there it is! You're confronted suddenly with this, and you don't usually go back and try to reason it out or say why. You'd think maybe you'd go back and – but you might out of curiosity and interest look at the last items the pc listed. Here's another little rule in listing or in finding goals, or in listing goals: The pc tends to dramatize the last goal or item put down.

Pc comes in in the morning and says, "Oh, my God. I just all night long lay there smelling fish." Look on their list. The last item they wrote in the session the day before was "fishmonger." "A disgusted fishmonger" is what they put, see. All night long, fish! That's odd, but the last item – it isn't the next item up that they haven't told you yet, it's the last item down. They'll tend to dramatize the last goal.

I'll tell – give you an instance of that. I told Reg this one time. And he – somebody who had just been put to listing goals as a therapeutic measure which of course is quite therapeutic – this person, in listing goals, had been listing them away, and all of a sudden "Yow-yow-yow-yow-yow!" and was on the phone and was terrified and everything else, and Reg remembered this little rule.

So, he made her write a few more goals. Got the last goal – sure enough, she was dramatizing the last goal she had written down, see. She hadn't actually stopped writing goals, because it was that goal, it just was the last goal on the list. So then she started dramatizing that goal. I don't know what the goal was, maybe it was "to be terrified." But you can count on that.

And it's very funny. You'll go along on a day's auditing, you take a break – take a break sometime – and the person has written down "a sad Chinaman." And during the break, you look at the pc – it's quite wonderful.

You – the mechanisms of the mind are gorgeous indeed. You say, "Well, all right. The fellow regurgitated it. He's already got rid of it. That is the reason why, it is now out there," so on. Well, that must not be the ease. In other words, he doesn't get rid of it all the way. Apparently items nudge, and goals nudge, the last one out, see.

You get some weird theories on this. It doesn't matter whether you have a theory on it or not. The fact is, you got to get items listed. And when they're listed down, why, they're down. And very ordinarily the ones higher on the scale are out. But the one you just put down isn't. And sometimes in a listing session, your pc will be looking at you suddenly, beadily, meanly. You say must have a missed withhold, and so forth. Don't be a knucklehead and bust up the whole session.

Actually, the less you do in a listing session, except list, why, the better off you are.

Because that's auditing. So the less you do, why, the better off

you're going to be. And the less trouble you're going to get into. And the reason the pc was sitting there, looking – well, why don't you look at the list which was right in front of you? You just got through looking down and you've written down "an angry mind reader." And there he is, the angry mind reader, see. Quite amazing.

Pcs apparently – not always, but sometimes – peel these things off by putting them on their own body first. I don't know, it's like you deal cards backwards, you know. Instead of – you know, you pull them on to the deck, see, not throw them off of the deck before you throw them out, see. It's like taking dealt cards that are scattered all over the place in the pc's bank, and then they put it on themselves, and then they throw the valence over their shoulder or something.

Well, in actual fact, they don't do anything with the valence. The valence is evaporating because the alter-ising thing is the basic purpose. See, valences and units and items don't go anyplace. They vanish. They don't go back on the track, or out into space, or clutter up anything. They just vanish, because they are built of alter-is of the pc's basic purpose. You understand? You don't have to worry about them.

Now, the signs of a wrong goal or bad listing is (1) the TA is mostly at 4.5 or 5. 0 – it never comes down; (2) pc is ARC breaky; (3) pc is looking bad – there's your "firefly factor"; (4) no pain. Doesn't matter how much sen is present, as long as there's also pain, you understand, but no pain – man, there's something wrong, see; (5) all sen – which of course contains no painbut all sen, nothing but sen, nothing but sensation. The pc has been weeping for the last four sessions. Now that's sensation, man.

I had a pc tell me just a moment ago that no sensation was coming off, and I know the pc was crying in session today. See, pcs are not reliable judges of this. The auditors have to ask. You understand? You have to ask. You have to check up on this. Don't just sit there forever. Just ask once in a while if the pc's got any pain or if the pc is dizzy or if the pc feels any emotion. Think of that once in a while when you're listing. But of course, keep it to a minimum, don't chatter on it, because it's just for your data.

'Is everything going all right?"

Pc hurts. "Fine."

"That's dandy."

Now, if it's all sen, this is really going wrong. Now, this is something that you should start worrying about. All sen – now this is wrong. There's something real wrong here. Now, you're getting suppressions and you're getting all kinds of things, and it might even go back to a wrong goal, you see. But suppress, protest, the pcs auditing under protest, pc is ARC broke, pc is suppressing the lines, pc – usually, the commonest cause of a pc going all

sensation is not wrong goal. The commonest cause of it is the pc doesn't understand the listing lines. Pc no dig.

You say, "Who or what would want to catch catfish?" and the pc doesn't understand it. You see, because you the auditor understand the line is no test at all of whether the pc understands the line.

Now, number 6 is bank beefing up. Now, that's a colloquialism. But I don't know anything – to express it better. If you said, "The bank is becoming more solid and is pressurizing the pc, and this or that and the other thing; and sensation is tremendously and oppressively present, and there appears to be more bank in the morning than there was in the afternoon previous; and there's more and more bank, and there are ridges of the bank are getting rather solid," and so forth – this is what comes under the heading of "bank beefing up." See, in other words, it's just there's something being fed to this bank. It's getting solider. And it can become as solid as a board. And if you let a pc go that far, you'll half-kill him, see. It can really be gruesome.

Now, (7) what you can expect after that is the pc is sick and nauseated.

Bank will beef up – that's not too bad – bank beefs up some more. It's getting kind of solid. It's got solid fringes on it. The pc feels like he's in some kind of an invisible iron suit or something weird is occurring here. In other words, the engrams and things are getting heavier and more solid. And he can't see them, he can feel them worse, and that sort of thing. This kind of thing happening is the result of wrong goal or bad listing. That's mostly seen when you're listing a wrong goal. It can become *awful* gruesome on a wrong goal. But it can also proceed from bad listing.

Pc's becoming sick and nauseated, that's pretty much wrong goal. It's seldom that listing drives them that far. But a wrong goal can drive them that far. They can start losing their cookies, man. Their weight going up, pc nauseated and dizzy and room going around and mest going out of plumb. You know, a room has eight points at the baseboard and ceiling, you see, and those will sometimes go completely askew. You know, eight points no longer make a box. They make a twisted space. The room looks like that to them. You get the idea? Well, motion goes haywire on these people. Bzzzzzz! Bum show. Rough, rough on them.

That's a wrong goal overlisted. And you should've been able to detect it before it got to there.

Now, how do you patch up a ease that's gone wrong? How do you patch them up? Well, you check over and get rid of all earlier found goals than the goal the pc is listing, or all other goals than the pc was listing that were found at any time and were said to be the pc's goal. You understand? We'll take all excess goals whether they were before the goal or after the goal that is being listed. See, all excess goals on the pc.

Sometimes, several goals have been found on a pc, and then they find one of the earlier goals is it, and then everybody neglects to do anything about the last three goals found that were listed maybe. Well, clean them up. Clean up those goals. Pc says they've been cleaned up already or it appears in an auditing report, check them for a cleanup. Just a rapid Tiger Drill on them. After all, it's only four or five goals, see. There's three minutes worth of work, see. But check it up. These goals charged up in some way or another. Something going on here.

All right. Get rid of them, in other words, and you'll find out sometimes that they have oppressed the right goal. So that as the items were listed, or something, the session's becoming restimulative, ARC breaks and that sort of thing have tended to throw one of these other goals into action. And it's oppressing the right goal. And the pc is beginning to wonder if the other one wasn't his goal. You got the idea? So you get all kinds of oddball things going on. So just make sure that goals the pc has supposed – been led to suppose in processing were his goal, that those goals are out and flat.

It isn't that they'll charge up again and come back in, but just make sure that it is done. Of course, if they aren't, what you do is give them a Big Tiger Drill and get rid of them. You see, a Big Tiger Drill that you were watching last night on TV demonstration is not Prepchecking. It just adds more buttons and plus-and-minus buttons, and plays it out to get off the maximal amount of sensation and somatic in the minimal amount of time.

Then you prepcheck the goal. And the way to prepcheck a goal – this might be news to you – is give it a time duration and name the goal.

Now, "On auditing – or in auditing on the goal to catch catfish . . . " See. Ah well, this is all right. "In auditing, on the goal to catch catfish . . . " that's pretty good for patch-up. That's good! You can get old goals firing, you can do all kinds of things with it.

But if you're going to prepcheck, and you're going to sit back there with a repetitive question and do a full-blown Prepcheck on this goal, then you'd better use time duration. Remember in your releases on Prepchecking the importance of time span. Don't worry about listing, don't worry about this, don't worry about that. Let's use a time span.

So you get an auditing command something like, "On the goal, to catch catfish " – and this is one month before the goal was found, as far as you can figure it was ". . . since January 1961 has anything been suppressed?" "On the goal, to catch catfish, since January 1961, has anything not been suppressed?" Alternate question, back and forth, and you will work yourself out quite a deal.

Now, that seems to be a rather large mouthful. But you would be surprised how many self-audits you catch. The interest of a goal is such that it leads people to self-audit far beyond any processing ever did. They speculate, they do it, they figure, they think. After all, you're monkeying with their basic purpose, so of course it goes into a high degree of restim. And they wonder about it and they occlude it and they try to prepcheck themselves, all kinds of

weird things. I wonder if I've suppressed my goal?" Well, why don't they ask themselves the auditing question and they're off to the races.

Now, it happens to be impossible – impossible, I repeat – it happens to be impossible to self-audit a goal. Now, you can list the lines on a goal, if somebody makes them up for you and says he'll beat your head in if you don't write the answers down. As long as the thing is tiger drilled in, the person's still got an auditor, don't you see? It's an extended session. But – now watch this – you've got the Opposition terminals, which are mostly sen, and you've got the terminals of the goal. And those sit in the bank, to a large degree, opposite each other. Got this? See, they're opposite each other.

We'll say, blob one faces blob two. Well, blob one is some kind of a mishmash of own terminals that also had the goal. And blob two are Opposition terminals that never had the goal but always opposed it. You got that? All right. The fellow's going to prepcheck his own goal. Ha-ha! Now, he's sitting there in blob one, see, very happily. So he says, "I think I'll prepcheck this goal.

See, On the goal, to catch catfish, let's see, has anything been suppressed?" And he of course is instantly into blob two, facing blob one. And blob two has sensation on it. And it's a mess of sensation. And he can't feel any pain. And one of the first things that alarms him is the fact that he's dizzy and doesn't hurt. So he says, "It can't be my goal. It can't be my goal, because there's no pain on it. There's only sensation. And I remember Ron saying this."

Well, he goes down the street a few minutes afterwards, and he slips accidentally into blob one, see, that has the goal "to track" and the pain on it. And he says, "Ouch!" And tends to avoid, now, blob one. He says, "Well, that doesn't feel too comfortable," and he kind of tends to back out of blob one, and there's no place to go but blob two. So he (backs) into blob two, and he's had it.

Do you see, that self-auditing on the goal leads to these very interesting things. Now, self-listing: it'd be very unlikely that if somebody found your goal and didn't make up your lines, and didn't do this for you and didn't do that for you, and didn't tiger drill the goal, every time, that you would ever be able to list it by yourself. But given those requirements, you probably, possibly, could sit down and list the goal at somebody else's behest – see, with the auditing commands at the top of the sheets in somebody else's handwriting. You see that? Possibility of doing that.

As a matter of fact, if you were very powerful and pervasive as far as somebody else was concerned, you could actually tell them to go ahead and list the goal by themselves after you'd prepared all the sheets. And then you tiger drilled them regularly to throw them back into the right valences and lines. But even that throws them into the wrong lines, see, for the wrong questions, unless that's been very thoroughly impressed on them.

But you see there is some possibility of self-listing. But there's no possibility of self-

tiger drilling, or self-prepchecking. Won't work. I make my point? You go flippity-flop.

I'm sure in this room there's hardly a person who hasn't, to some slight degree, wondered if his goal has been suppressed, and thought it over, just suppressively: "I wonder if he's invalidated something today?" I don't know if you've all been alarmed at this. But every once in a while you wonder if anything has been invalidated today, and you get sensation, you see. If you're very educated as an auditor, and if you didn't know these other points Im giving you right now, you could become quite worried.

Of course you say, "Has anything been invalidated, on the goal to catch catfish? " and instantly the goal items which you're in are over there, and you're in the items with sen. In other words, you get the pain and sen on wrong lines, and everything goes to hell in a balloon, see, when you start doing this. You follow this activity?

Now, when you tiger drill the goal every session, that's an insurance against the – a wrong goal. See, that's good insurance. So it actually leaves as the main problem, bad listing.

You have to watch and be very alert, on listing sessions. And the things you're alert for are: high TA – 4.5, 5.0; pc ARC breaky; pc looking bad; no pain, all sen; bank beefing up; pc sick and nauseated. These are all bum things. And when you see those things, you start worrying.

And the answers to them is check over those earlier found goals, let's find out if anything happened there. Let's prepcheck the goal with the *date* line. Let's tiger drill the goal into good firing condition, and so forth. If we can't get it that way, then just prepcheck harder, and you'll either get the goal back or it was the wrong goal.

There's not any trick to listing. You don't have to be terribly clever. You don't have to be clever at all to list. You've got to be very workmanlike, very thorough and very competent. This is what it takes to run a good listing session. There's no clearing without listing. So don't relegate it as an unimportant activity and just toss it off and say that is that. Listing is good, and it's as brief as the auditor is good.

Now, I haven't talked to you anything about listing lines or what happens on lines, how you put lines together, because let me assure you, that is another story. But the actual conduct of a listing session should be very steady, very press-on, lot of confidence on the part of the pc in his auditor, no slips, no goofs. Regular, nice, smooth, keep the pc in-session, get the middle rudiments in only when the pc looks like they're completely gone on something. And just carry on and do a good, sound, competent session. And he'll go Clear as fast as he has confidence in you as a listing auditor.

And it's very tough on a pc to change auditors in the middle of listing.

Can be done, but only if the second auditor is as good as the first one was. A good listing auditor is a good thing. He – they're not always to be found. Because auditors will

obsessively get in there, talk too much, try to do too much, alter-is too much, interrupt the pc, try to stop the pc from talking, Q-and-A on the things, question the items, write too slowly, improperly pronounce and call the auditing commands – all of these things lead to bad listing. So that what you want is smooth, steady, straightforward, predictable competence. You got that, man, your pc will go Clear and you'll see free needle on all those lines.

In absence of that you'll have a pc that'll look like he has a wrong goal.

It'll just be all sen, all ARC break, all upset, and *blah! You* don't want that, you want Clears. So listing to that degree is extremely important.

Thank you very much.