

3GA LISTING BY TIGER BUTTONS

A lecture given on
2 October 1962

Thank you.

You'll have to pardon me for being late. It was really quite an emergency.

You see, there was Gary Cooper and he was all by himself, you know, and he was fighting off these Indians. Gary, you know, he actually was raised next door to me in Helena, Montana. It was very, very funny to see him done up like Rudolph Valentino in the old 8-millimeter movies, you know, from way back. I run one off for the kids every night. And even they're starting to laugh.

Well, the subject of our lecture this evening ... This is the 2nd of October, I think. I hope you're in the same day as I'm in. If you've been listed on these lines today, no telling what day you're in! This is the 2nd of October, AD 12. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one. And the subject of this lecture is "Listing by Tiger Buttons – 3GA." This replaces, and you can to all intents and purposes destroy your notes of lecture number two, 28 September, AD 12. Because since that time you have had a complete revisal.

Male voice: 27th.

Twenty-seventh? Your notes of the 27th of September, second lecture.

First lecture stands. I made them that way – figured there'd be something that you'd get into, and you did. Because after that lecture you asked enough foolish questions and pronounced enough imponderables that it was very obvious that the work which I had been doing slowly and casually on listing had to be done in a hurry. So you cost me my weekend. And there will be a fee.

At something on the order of 4:30 A.M., Monday, I was just finishing this work up. This was quite a sprint.

There were many things wrong with listing. There are many things right with listing. And we must remember, first and foremost, that the old type of listing we were doing – writing down the buttons – answers, pardon me, writing down the answers to lines; on four lines – "Who or what would want goal?" "Who or what would not want goal?" "Who or what

would oppose goal?” “Who or what would not oppose goal?” – brought a lot of people to free needles on these lines and made first-goal Clears. It had to be in the presence of very smooth auditing. It had to be in the presence of good auditing.

And wherever any rough auditing occurred – now, PR tell you what happened to these four lines – where any rough auditing occurred of any kind whatsoever, you got a jam-up and the tone arm started up toward 4.5 or 5.0, which is standard position for a tough stick. That's standard position: if you've got somebody's tone arm riding 4.5 or 5.0 during a listing session and it just goes on riding there and on and on and on riding there, man, that is wrong. Something is very wrong, as I will go into in this lecture.

But in the presence of rough auditing, a pc suppresses. And in that suppression is able to produce sen and no longer gets pain even when he's listing on the right goal.

That's quite important, because a right goal can be listed so roughly, with the presence of sufficient rough auditing, that it'll look like a wrong goal. And, of course, in the presence of the smoothest auditing in the world, the same phenomenon takes place when you're trying to list a wrong goal.

But, in other words, rough auditing during a listing session can make a goal look wrong, fire wrong, act wrong and otherwise raise the devil with the ease and everything connected with it.

Anyway, there is no substitute for good auditing. See? There's no substitute for good auditing and a good auditor.

Now, what's odd is that there are lots of people in Scientology whose goals are not answered up to or compared to or measure up to or declare that they should be active in Scientology, who are in Scientology and who are doing very good auditing. It's not true that everybody in Scientology is dictated to be there because of their goal one way or the other. That's a lot of – lot of nonsense.

But it also is true that goals very often assist people to be a good auditor. Let's say – let's have somebody with a goal “to listen to people's troubles” or something like that. He won't be as smooth an auditor as somebody who has a goal “to build mountains” or something, but he will still have some little special skills of one kind or another that pcs will find quite, quite attractive. You understand?

And then there is the broad majority of goals of people in Scientology which are just neutral. I mean they don't necessarily make them better auditors and they don't necessarily make them worse auditors. And that is the majority.

And then there is a small group, a minority, whose goals are in opposition to Scientology, who feel desperately that if their goals were ever to be achieved it would be over the dead body of Scientology. In other words, as long as Scientology exists, why, they'll never

make it, you see? In other words their oppterm is Scientology. And those people make very rough auditors. They're practically unteachable. It's terrible. And they also stop auditing and they'll do that sort of thing.

You determine what people these are just with your rock slam test – you know, your HCOB that gives you the new Security Check – which would just rock slam. You know? “Consider committing overt against . . .” and then you say, “Well, Scientology, the organization, your auditor, Ron.” You get rock slam on one or more of those things, you got somebody who'd be awfully hard to train and who will make a very lousy auditor until you've got that goal. You just take it from me, I've watched them now. I've watched a lot of them. I've wondered why is it that some of these people can audit and why is it that some of these people can't audit and why is it that the vast majority of people in Scientology can audit?

Well, the goal sometimes assists, sometimes retards, and the vast majority has no influence. Now, the rock slam test takes care of the only part of it we have great interest in, which is the people who cant audit. The reason they cant audit is just that they can never get grooved in on the subject of auditing; they're always doing something weird in auditing. The pc says something and they jump down their throats. One way or the other they louse up what the PC does or says, you understand? And what they do is either add or omit and they never just audit. They add or omit.

Give you an idea. PC gives him an item: “a centipede.” All right, the auditor who has an oppgoal to Scientology says, “a chrysanthemum.”

And the PC says, “No, a centipede.”

And the auditor says, “Well, how does a pc – how does a centipede answer the question: 'Who or what would have many feet?' Well, I've got it now: a naturopath.”

And the pc says, “No! A centipede! A centipede. A centipede. A centipede. A centipede!”

See, you've got a missed withhold going here, see? And the auditor says, “Have I missed a withhold on you in this session?”

“Well, you haven't taken this item!”

“No, that couldn't be it. The missed withhold must be earlier.”

Well, things like this happen in auditing.

Well, you start mucking that into a listing session or never acknowledging anything the PC says. He does 465 items, see, 465 items and finally he gets an acknowledgment, which is “Mm-hm.” See? Now, that's an omission. But you can use an acknowledgment the same way to just louse it up like crazy.

All of a sudden the PC gets a horrible gleam in his eye, “Who or what would have many feet?” you know? And, my God, he thinks of armies and centipedes, and so forth, and this avalanche is just about ready to roar, you know? Just about ready to roar, and he says, “A centipede.”

And the auditor says, “*Thank you!*”

The PC says, “Uh – eh – yeah, all right – uh – an arm...”

“*Thank you!*”

And the PC says, “What was I talking about? Where did they go? What part of the roof didn't fall in?” Get the idea?

Well, therefore, in view of the fact that errors of one kind or another can interrupt a listing session; and in view of the fact that PC protest, ARC breaks and rough auditing can make a goal simply – well, it can be found again – but it makes the goal turn on sen, look like a wrong goal, make the PC upset, not go Clear (that's the main thing that's wrong). He can list for months and months and months and months and months and he wouldn't go Clear under this type of auditing. In view of that fact, we required a type of listing which permitted a minimal chance of error on the part of the auditor. See, so an auditor's – an auditor would get minimally in the pc's road. And we have it in 114 line listing. Listing by Tiger Buttons we will call it.

And we have that for this reason: The auditor doesn't comm lag by writing the item down, he simply makes a little strike on a card. He can't forget the auditing command because it's right on the card in front of him. And all he's trying to do is get all the items he can on the card – now, this is important to you because it isn't in the bulletin – he's trying to get all the items he can on the card without dragging the PC into an overlist. He doesn't want this PC to go into a long comm lag or feel badgered so items become missed withholds.

The only judgment the auditor has to make is: Is he demanding more items than the PC has or is he cutting the PC off before the pc has given him all he has? And that is the only point of judgment in this listing.

That is the single, most important point of judgment. Does he shut the pc off before the pc has given all items pc easily has? Or does he badger the pc into giving more items than the pc has on that line? Because he'll drag the pc, on the second case of demanding more items than the pc has available, into a condition of invalidate. Items, when they're overlisted, feel invalidated; so, the pc becomes very doubtful and everything becomes unreal.

And, in the earlier case, the first case of cutting the pc off before the pc can give all of his items, the auditor introduces sen. So, you see, demanding more items than the pc has, produces invalidation, unreality on the part of the pc. You understand then? And keeping the pc from giving you all the items the pc has, produces sen.

So, if the condition of the pc degenerates on Listing by Tiger Buttons into total sensation and no pain, you know that the auditor is demanding more items from the pc than the pc has. You understand? If he's got an unreality growing up, you know that the pc is being made to overlist. Let me put it that way very straightly. Don't want to mix you up on it. I, myself, haven't got it out here in front of me. You understand?

For instance, pc will list on a flow and he'll list as long as the flow is flowing. But when the flow stops flowing he is then listing against a backflow which brings about a sensation of invalidation. Because the items which are backflowing against the items which he is trying to give, see, causes an unreality to take place. He doesn't think any item he's giving you is the right item for that line. Do you see that?

Audience: Yeah.

So if you run this flow *too long* in any one direction by demanding more items than the pc has, the pc will begin to think that the items he's giving you are unreal. Because the sensation of invalidation occurs when a line has been made to flow *too long* in one direction.

Now, on the other side of the picture – on the other side of this is, you keep the pc from giving you the items he has, then you put him on a whole string of missed withholds. He protests the session and turns on sensation.

So the two things you can expect, principally and primarily from rough or bad auditing on a pc where the auditor is getting in the pc's road most God awfully – it has to be pretty extreme. Most of you are sitting there thinking, well, you drop your pencil once in a while and this upsets the whole session ... No, no, it – you have to stand back of a session that is really being run by somebody – just whisper Scientology at him and the ... Well, you know, it isn't the needle that rock slams, you see; the needle doesn't rock slam. What happens is both ears rock slam and both eyeballs rock slam, see? Ah, you watch him trying to give a session; he'll pull one or the other of these things. And it has to be awfully *extreme* before it starts really showing up. It's colossal. The little blunders that you make from time to time, and so forth, that isn't going to upset anybody. You pick them up in the end ruds, and so on.

But you start this kind of thing, see, this big avalanche, and the pc's got centipedes, armies, so forth. And these things are just sort of stacked up in the slot and they're all ready to go down the chute, see. He just wants to hand them out to you, brrrrrrrr. See, like that. And you say to the pc – not you, but this auditor says to the pc . . .

The pc says, “Centi – “

“*Thank you!*”

And the pc says, “A – a – ar-armies, ar-armies, ar-armies, I think, ar-armies.”

“Thank you very much! Now, you don't have any more items, do you for this line?”

We're getting awfully *long* on this particular list anyway. Let's see, how many do we have here? Let's see. Awful lot!"

It's pretty bad. You'll see it. You'll start a co-audit someday and you'll see it. You'll actually see it with your naked, bare eyes; and you'll be ashamed. Be fantastic. We stand back of some co-audit, untrained auditor and he'll be trying to do this listing on somebody and, honest, they practically do everything but pull the wall off the wall and shove it in the pcs teeth.

Now, what happens to the pc? The pc suppresses. He's being made to suppress. He suppresses the auditor, he suppresses the list, he suppresses everything, and so on, stacks himself up on a bunch of missed withholds, with all the consequences of the missed withholds, because each item, then, that he didn't give you becomes a missed withhold. And the next thing you know this goal that has been turning on sen once in a blue moon and pain all the time, now turns on sen all the time and pain never. And he's just going wog, wog, wog. And you can take a real goal and monkey it up this way, and you can actually have the pc getting the walls out of plumb.

I was fooling around with some research one day – during a demonstration session (withhold from you) – and I had been doing some research lines and I'd been trying to put some lines together and was doing some research actually, analogous to this bulletin. But this was many weeks ago, before I went to America.

I was sitting there and I had been, of course, fooling around with a bogus goal. You know, and trying to list this bogus goal. And it was actually the way I was working it out, you know – I got to a point trying to work out lines where I turned on motion. And you don't just turn on motion so that you sort of feel like things are moving and they're not or you get dizzy or something like that. Man, you can turn on motion which is really interesting.

And while I was giving that session (it was to Reg there) why – I didn't miss any meter reads as you noticed but – well, I never have – but that – the meter was moving away from me like this suddenly. It was a little bit hard to find out where to look for the needle. And the table – the table was going swoop. And every once in a while the floor would go the opposite direction, swoop. I knew what it was so it wasn't disturbing me any; it was just where was I supposed to put my eyes.

But pcs don't have that much equilibrium and they often get very worried when they walk down the street and have the sidewalk in the middle of the road and then back where they aren't. You got the idea?

They also will become sick and nauseated if they're really roused up. And if this is done on a wrong goal, you'll just put the pc in the hospital. Supposing you had a wrong goal and then you wrong listed it: pc – hospital. I mean, that's about all there is to that.

Psychiatric special. If this stuff ever got into the hands of psychiatrists, why, they'd have full institutions, brother. They'd make up their mind what goal it was.

So I myself through listing wrong goals and through fooling with goals in research have a very good subjective reality on what can happen to somebody like this. It's very rough.

Now, the other one is not quite what you would be very familiar with.

It's sort of a hidden manifestation. But have you ever seen one of these characters walking around who is totally doubtful all the time? You've tried to sell them Scientology, I know that, from time to time. One of the ways to get to them when they do this to you; you say, "Well, now, well, you help people, see. That's what we do in Scientology; you help people. You know, you do things for them, you help people."

And they say, "Well, how do you know you really help them?" You know? And, "Studies of the mind are no good, really, because, I know, because I had a brother once and it was all pretty bad, and so forth. And what do the medical doctors think of this?" You know, all this kind of stuff that goes on and on and on.

It's very interesting. You've only got to ask them on any analogous subject, such as medicine, you say, "Well, what do you think of medical doctors?"

"Well, I don't know. Well, how does anybody know?" What's amusing is, is this person is so disoriented in general, is they will do the same thing with all subject. And you think they're talking about Scientology. No, they're just talking and this is the way they talk, see? And because you're interested and sincere in what you're talking about, you never – you miss the boat. All you've got to do is take your index finger and just shift the conversation about a degree and get them to talking about psychiatry.

You get agreement, see, because the psychiatrists are no good either, see? See, and you get – they're just like the wind in the willows. You know? Any breath of air will blow that unreality around. And it's all unreal; the sensation is it's unreal. Those walls aren't real. They know that people have been kidding them. Other people pretend things are real but this only convinces them that everybody pretends. You see? They *know* that there are no well people. See? They know everything is bad. But, basically, it isn't real. Nothing is real.

Now, although this is a phenomenon which can be produced by lessening the overt, which is how it's normally produced – things aren't real to somebody who has many overts against those things.

See, the person – well, fellow's been burning houses and he's been spending lifetimes burning houses, and he's – just does nothing but burn houses. You watch him go up to the front door of a house someday and he can't even find the doorknob, you know. He tries to walk through walls – houses don't exist. There aren't any different kinds of houses. It's the most remarkable thing, you see? Tremendous numbers of overts against some object or item or

type of person brings about an unreality on the overter's part for that thing, see, and it becomes totally unreal.

For instance, I have this to some degree on religion myself. And it traces immediately back to burning whirling dervishes. I just got into a bad habit, you know? Whirling dervishes show up, why, you execute them, you know. That kind of thing. I mean, that's the wrong thing to do, let me tell you. It produces an unreality on the subject of whirling dervishes. See, you go around whirling dervishes and they just are a blur – when they're whirling and when they're not whirling. They're thin. You can see straight through them almost. See, that's under the phenomenon of they become unreal because one has overts against them. That's the rationale back of this.

But the same exact phenomenon can be produced by causing a person to outflow too long in one direction on a goal line. See? So that he gets a backflow inevitable. You understand? You see this dramatization in life as somebody does bad things in the community until people have to do bad things to him.

Well some dog – he goes around biting people or something like this for a long time, and eventually they'll do something to the dog.

You see this in real life that an individual committing overts has things committed on him, see. You see this in life. People enforce this one.

But I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about the simple thing of the fellow who throws a bowling ball out in front of him long enough will mentally restimulate a backflow against bowling balls. And the way to make bowling balls unreal is just to keep throwing them away from you and never recovering them. And they will eventually get totally unreal. You see why? You see that?

So when you make a pc overlist, what he's done is go out the flow line. Remember this is a very aberrated zone of action in the pc's mind. He's pretty spinny on these subjects. He's very identified and overflowed and he jammed up. Well, if his goal was to be a pinball machine, he'd have a marvelous mess on the subject of everything was a pinball machines and the basic purpose of everybody in existence was to do things to or with pinball machines, don't you see? And everything is identified with everything; all purposes are identified with his purpose, you see?

And you're going down this channel . . . You are operating now in Book One's A=A=A. You see, you're operating right where it lives. And don't be surprised sometime if the pc has some weird identification and you just can't make any sense out of it at all. Yet the pc says it's an identification. He looks at you quite blandly and says, “Well, all ashtrays are just exactly like roofs. You know that. All ashtrays are roofs,” you know? Or “All women are mothers.” He believes this, you see.

But you could understand that – how he could get into that. But now, how all ashtrays are roofs! You say, “This guy is unhinged someplace.” Well, of course, you're operating in the zone and area of unhinged hinges. They're by the gross lot on the goals channel because he's got everything identified with everything, and so on, because his flow lines have been all overflowed and backflowed. You see?

He's got a whole lot of specialized flow lines – all of them overreached, all of them backflowed on, and so forth. And when you're taking those things apart you must take them apart as to what's there. You can only take apart what's there. Do you understand? And although it looks to you, the auditor, as you sit there listing on a pc, that he's dreaming up these items and handing them to you. No, he's looking right straight down one groove, and it'll be just one single bunches of file cards in the file machine, you see. There it is it's just that many items. And it goes right on down to that many items. And *one more item will* regenerate a backflow so that the last item he gives you he will now be doubtful about.

Now, he can put it down as – with perfect certainty, “a centipede.” And then you cause him to list ten, fifteen more items in that direction. He hasn't got them, man! He's got to go in past the opposite flow, which is now generated and flowing, and reach around. It's like going upstream against a roaring river, don't you see? And, after a while, he kind of says to himself, “It isn't worth it. There's nothing there.” You know? The spray in his eyes and everything. So, you ask him for all these additional items and he hasn't got them: “Centipede” that he put down as totally real now seems not to belong on the list. See, he put it down as totally real and if you gave him the item back, he'd tell you, “I really don't think that that would want to walk. No, I don't think so.”

Similarly the next ten, fifteen items, they just go. I mean, they're so unreal they'll just start disappearing. He won't even be able to tell you what item he has just said or anything like this when you overflow this.

But the basic thing I'm trying to get to is you can produce a total unreality on the part of the pc. You can make him feel just like he is in a world which doesn't exist. Now, there are characters around whose world doesn't exist and who don't exist in any world of anything to them. You run into brick walls but this pc never does, see. Never seems to be able to run into a brick wall. Of course he's always coming in scratched and contused, but he can't tell you how. See, brick walls are unreal. That's his difficulty. And, of course, he always runs into them – they don't exist.

But his reaction toward life is uncertainty and insecurity. So, making a pc list too many items brings about a mental framework of insecurity, unreality, doubtfulness. And, of course, that extends over to the auditor, it extends over to auditing, it extends over to everything.

So, you could get a guy's goal and then list him wrong and have him believing at the

other end of the line that Scientology was totally unreal, that it'd never done anything for him. I mean, you could list him into a hole to that degree.

Now, the weight factor of overweightness, and so forth, also belongs on the other side of this. That's not letting somebody give you the items. You can actually put pounds on somebody by continuing to miss the withholds. Isn't that interesting? Increase somebody's weight with this kind of auditing. Now, smooth auditing would decrease somebody's weight. Definitely.

Now, do you see then, these are just – these are the two major factors. There are probably other things you can do. You could confuse a pc. You can get him wog-wog, so, you start in on the line “Who or what would want to catch catfish?” The pc answers “Who or what would want to catch catfish?” and you say, “No, you're answering 'not want' to catch catfish.” You ask him “Who or what would want to catch catfish?” And then all of a sudden you make a mistake and the pc – he doesn't know, see. So he's sort of on a notknow. See, you can produce confusion; you can produce various things. But they're not as serious as these other two phenomena.

Now, therefore, this type of listing is designed to minimize the amount of time necessary to record the fact that the pc is giving you items. And that is its first advance.

A lot of you have asked me, from time to time, why we wrote them down at all. Well, we had to record them in some fashion. And I wasn't yet sure that we wouldn't have to do something about them. And I've become sure we don't have to do anything with these items. So, therefore, all you want is a tally system. You do have to have some check on parity to find lines are overlisted or underlisted. You do have to have this. So all you need there is a tally system. And I've introduced the crudest tally system there can be, which is four slants and a bar. And if you will look down at your right hand you'll find you have five fingers and man counts ably. It's instinctive. You go slant, slant, slant, slant, crossbar.

You know that man's method of counting is based on five, not ten, see. You know that you can conceive five objects just like that. Science was, by the way, trying to prove fifteen or twenty years ago that a man could not conceive more than four. And I didn't go into the root of this thing, but I think it was being put out by some sociological, electronics computer man who had no thumb. Because the one thing you can count with a glance – you can count five.

As a matter of fact there are four hinges on these doors and one lock, if you consider the lock a huge lock. You can certainly grasp that number at a glance.

So five is the easiest recording number. It's instinctive. Now, that's chosen not because auditors are stupid but because auditors becoming involved with a pc, and so forth, haven't got all their attention on numbers. So I've taken the most basic unit or cluster figure which is five, so an auditor won't be thrown by it.

He's trying to handle a pc who's having a hell of a time. PC's squirming all over the floor and falling out of the chair and ARC breaking and writhing and all that sort of thing. Well, he's liable to get completely *blooey* on the subject of tallying. But if you give him an instinctive tally figure that is an idiot's figure, you know, he can keep on doing that without any attention. You got the idea? That's why that's chosen.

Now, that introduces no slowdown. That introduces no slowdown, and it gives the auditor time to watch his meter and its behavior and also keep up his auditor's report and give the pc attention.

Now, most listing sessions, the auditor has become so engrossed in writing things down, that he has not been able to give enough attention to the session itself and so has lost control of his pc. But if you're good at this, you can take – and you can look straight at the pc who is giving you five items, let's say, and you can go one, two, three, four, five, strike. You see, you don't need to look at what you're doing to record it. See? That, in other words, has been reduced to an idiot simplicity.

You know, it's very interesting the research I've done on this. It was up as high as 182 lines over the weekend. And I had one system – you can probably all think up better systems maybe, one way or the other, but I don't think you can think up simpler ones than this. That's the one that takes genius. Anyway ...

I thought of getting a tabulator but every time the pc said something, you stepped with your thumb on something, you see. So, all you had to do was shift your thumb every time the pc said an item, and then before you turned the card over you simply wrote the figure that was on the tabulator on your card and turned it over. See, that's very nice. There's only one thing wrong with it: it clicks. They will inevitably click. So the most silent means and furthermore, it's a mechanical; you have to have something. Furthermore, mechanical things often break. And this requires a minimum: it requires a pencil and some cards.

Now, one of the big things I had trouble getting over, and it isn't totally solved: how to make a maximum number of items on one card without having to rewrite the card. See? Well, frankly, this is not totally covered in the bulletin, but you don't have to rewrite the whole card list; you can get by overstrikes with three colors of pencil, use. Because you can always see a group. You probably couldn't see the little individual slant lines if you had a black one and a red one and a green one, don't you see, on top of each other. But you can see there's a black, red, green, you see, and the card is totally filled with black, red, green. You've still got an approximation even though it was very badly done. You get the idea? I mean ... Now, the way to do that isn't in this bulletin.

That card which totally fills up: You take a stapler and you staple to it another card and rewrite that one line on the face of your fresh card so they turn over two at a crack. You understand? And that doesn't let it all get separated out from underneath you. Now, that will,

oddly enough, leave you rewriting only some cards. In other words, you don't have to rewrite the whole list all the way down. That's one of the easy ways to get on it.

Now, the odd part – here's another one: If you don't even want to rewrite the line, you can take a card that is less wide which still exposes the line and staple that onto the front of your filled-up card. You understand? I don't care what you do with this, but you can do this job with a stapler. Now, I wouldn't worry much about the backs of cards. If you turn the card over – if you turn the card over – you have lost sight of its overlisteredness. You can make a little mistake there, don't you see? Because this card turned over looks just like any card face up until you turn it over. You follow me?

Audience: Uh-huh.

Because – and it looks like it's a single card. Whereas if you've got a double width card comes up with this thing, it's immediately called to your attention that this line is awfully long. Do you see how that would be? This line is pretty doggone long if you've got a double card in your hand; whereas, this would not be observable to you if you had only one card turned over with the line written on the reverse side of it again.

Well, now these things – we probably will do things to them; you'll probably find things change. But I've gone over this pretty thoroughly and tried to reduce it down through its cycle. All things go from a complex – from a somewhat complex to a more complex to a simple basis.

You've seen this time and time again in Scientology. We'll run this cycle:

I'll bring out something that's very simple, some auditor will be complete idiot with it, I'll find out it's not totally workable, some goofball things will occur, some pcs will have some hard luck with it, and so PR make it more complicated, see, and then add the things that you mustn't do to it, and then push it on forward into more complicated, and all of a sudden the whole thing falls downstairs to becoming simpler than it was in the first place.

Well, I've tried to make this listing run that cycle over the last weekend.

And I did it. One time I had it up to 182 lines. In other words, I was cutting it – it went way up; the complexities were terrific – and then cut it back to a simplicity.

Now, as you sit there listing, several questions will occur to you: How often should you use this question that is on the card to the pc? How often should you use this?

Well, you use it as often as the pc isn't answering it easily.

In other words, your pc says, “A centipede, an army and a black cat.”

And you say, “That's fine. Thank you.”

And you didn't get any comm lag there, did you? No comm lag. But he stopped. He

isn't still thinking, particularly, he's looking at you now; he thinks he's done his duty, don't you see? So you ask him the question again and he says, "There aren't any more."

Now, you think, well, that's going to leave an unanswered auditing question, and sure enough it could, but he won't tell you there aren't any more until you really start straining him.

Now, the question you're trying to answer is how often should you ask the auditing command, don't you see? How often should you ask this thing? How often should you repeat it? And how hard should you pound on the pc's head in order to get answers?

Well, in actual fact, you only want answers until he comm lags hard over them. The comm lag is going to be followed by an invalidate. His comm lag will end up with "trying to find the right one." And "trying to find the right one" will move over into an invalidation of anything. Do you see? So your symptom of the pc having been driven too far – already driven too far – is he can't get the right word. He's trying to think of the right word. Now, that isn't a phenomenon of the mind; that is an overrun of a flow. And you've already ridden him too far on that flow. You've goofed. That is classifiable as a goof, don't you see? So, where you want to stop is the comm lag which precedes that phenomenon. The pc is saying, "A centipede and – ah-ah-hmm-ah... A-ahhmm – ah . . ." And if you just let him go on with that, why, he'll say, "Well, I'm trying to think of the right word for it," is his next stage, see? And if you let that go through and he thought of the right word for it, then the item he gives you after that is not the right item at all. See, first it's the wrong word, then it's wrong item. Comm lag, wrong word, then wrong item, see. That's the way he's going to answer you up on these things. So you got to catch him at that moment when he is just about to comm lag and hasn't done so very critically. Do you understand? That actually then requires some sensitivity on the part of the auditor.

That's why I've unburdened the necessity of the auditor in HCOB October 1st – unburdened the auditor's attention on the writing down lists and that sort of thing. Because that's the critical point.

Now, if the pc says there aren't any more items on that line, this is not a balk. Do you understand something about listing. Pcs *never balk*. Do you understand that? Pcs *never balk!* They can be overdriven or distracted to the point where they're not in-session. But if they're even vaguely in-session they just *never balk*. They're not balking at listing. Do you understand? A pc will not *balk* at listing. He will always give you an item or another item or three items or four items, but he can be *prevented* from listing, see? The balk isn't there but the prevention is there. And if you look at it in this framework, both doing auditing and supervising auditing, you'll see where the goofs occur. Do you follow that?

You see a pc balking – apparently, see – just recognize pcs don't balk. Pcs have to be *prevented* from listing. See, the balk is just an apparenacy. And there's something there that's preventing the pc from listing and it isn't in the pc's head. It's either the lines are wrong –

somebody's written up his lines, like "Who and – who or what would want to help, not suppress, because he didn't catch catfish?" and the poor pc is saying ... The line was never cleared with him in the first place, you see? Nobody came along and said to him, "Well, can you answer this line?" as the first time the line comes up on the pile, you see. "All right, here it is: Who or what would want to run away when centipedes aren't catching Suppress – Help?"

He says, "Huh?"

The lines are wrong or the auditor is actively preventing him from being in-session. Session started out like this: He got into the body of the session, the needle was free, everything was clean, got the goal firing – the goal fired beautifully, and so forth. And the pc is all sitting there and he's getting steamed up. He knows just where he is: They're going to start on the Create. See, he already knew this because he knew the bulletin or something. And he's going to start on the Create, and he's already got the first item there, see, a "candy machine," see. And he's actually been thinking of this as the next item. He's about to say ... You know, he's just waiting. All you have to do, you know – all you have to do is just open that stack of cards at the right place and you're going to get a "candy machine," see, bang!

And the auditor says, "Well, now, all right, now, let's get in the middle rudiments for this session." You know that confounded candy machine will go through the rest of the session. It'll go clear around till they get around to it again. And it'll come up some day or another on a Suppress. He's prevented from listing.

So pcs – just as a rule of thumb on the thing – from your standpoint as a Supervisor, an auditor's Instructor, and in auditing, and so forth – they just never balk, they're prevented. And you look, not for something that's wrong with the pc, you look for something that's wrong with that listing session or what's going on in it.

Because, listen, you list lines on a pc, it's something like putting a button in a candy machine, see. Penny goes down the slot, hits the button in the machine, something in there whirs and some candy comes out the bottom of the machine. Only this machine never breaks.

You *can't* ask him for anything on his goal line without him giving it to you. You just can't do it! You see, it's very nearly impossible. Unless when you ask him, you won't let him give it to you. You have to get in there with a little sledgehammer and monkey up the chute, you know. You have to feed it an Irish penny or something. There ought to be ought on this. He has to be prevented because, frankly, he just will deal these things out like a professional gambler dealing cards. He just can't help himself; he'll just deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal, deal. You just turn up the stack there and you read the auditing command and you're going to get answers if you're anything on the beam at all.

Once in a while you'll get into trouble because he's got two buttons of the Tiger Drill

crossed. That is to say, you should be running Suppress at this stage of the game and you aren't; and you figure it would be a Q and A to go back to the Suppress section and do anything about it, and so on. But you've already done something wrong if you get to that state. You've already done something wrong if you've got two buttons mixed up or something. See, something's already gone haywire with the auditing.

Well, the thing to do is just sit there and list. Get your rudiments in, get the goal to fire, make the pc happy and cheerful. And sit there with your pencil alert and your stack just right and don't drop them on the floor. Just sit there and deal them off and ask the question. And the pc says, "An army, a centipede, a bulldozer, a-uh-uhm ... That's about all I can think of."

And you say, "Thank you very much." And you turn the card and you ask the next question. See, just as neat as that.

And then you say, "Now, who or what would oppose catching catfish?"

And he says, "Oppose catching catfish."

And you say, "Yes, that's right." Don't make him give himself the auditing command. Don't you see? The rules of auditing all apply in listing.

And you say, "All right, yes, that's right. Who or what would oppose

Say it softly so as not to blow him out of the water, but give him the command. He obviously hadn't got it, he's muttering it, see? And you say, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish?"

And he says, "A-ah-hm-hm-hm-hm ... Who or what would oppose catfish?"

"Yeah, that's right. Who or what would oppose catching catfish?"

"Hmhf' He says, "A game – I don't quite get the word – patrolman. Patrolman. Game patrolman. Patrolman. Patrolman. Warden!"

And you say (tick), "Thank you very much." And get the hell off of it, man. You got an answer to your auditing command, see, and you were lucky. Because that line was hanging fire right on the comm lag, and you opened it up on the comm lag. You understand? Get one item.

I sometimes ease the crush on a pc by saying, "Well, just give me one so the auditing question will be answered."

"Oh," he says very happily, "game warden." Gives you some old item. "Game warden!" You say, "All right. Well, that's fine. Thank you." Get how the thing goes?

But the whole attitude of the session must be one which permits the pc to list items. And if you want to know how to list, then delete all out of it that prevents the pc from listing. And you'll find out this is what has happened here on this Listing by Tiger Buttons. There's

practically everything out of it that prevents listing, still leaving those things in it which make people Clear.

Now, the whole – whole aspect, then, of a listing auditor is somebody who is in benign control. Benign control.

Now, get this as a definite difference to Sec Checking. You say, “Now, have you ever robbed a bank?”

And the pc goes clang! on the E-Meter.

And you say to the pc, “Come on, come on. Have you ever robbed a bank? I got a read here. What – ever robbed a bank?”

And he says, “*Ho-ho-ho-ho-ha-ha*, no, not me.” Clang! “No, I ... As a matter of fact, I was the victim of a bank robber one time. Uh – uh – I was actually in a company that had a bank that was robbed and they really did me in.”

And of course, the Sec Check Auditor is not worth his salt who wouldn't have said at that time, “Done, man, done. You know, done. Have you – now listen carefully – you, have you, you, you, you, the one sitting right in the chair, you, now, you. Got that now? Now, listen carefully: robbed – robbed a bank? Now, that's the question now. Now, I'm going to ask it on the meter. Have you robbed a bank? All right, that's null. Thank you very much.”

Or clang! “All right, what is it, man? What is it now? What bank? What bank? Come on give here, man, give, give, give.” You know? You know?

You don't do that with listing.

There are different types of auditing, appropriate to all occasions.

Benign control: you're running an airy session where we're all pals together. And sometimes the items are funny, too. And sometimes they're very sad. Nobody is asking you, the auditor, to shed crocodile tears in sympathy with the pc, but don't go laughing like a bunch of goons when he's saying, “A dying mother, a perishing infant, a starving puppy.” Don't sit there going to pieces, you see?

Sometimes I know it exerts your control because you know what he'll be doing a few minutes later: He'll say, “A starving mother!” You know? “Ha-ha!”

Another list this will come up: “Who or what is no damn good?” you see. That'll come up on that list. Different frame of mind.

All right. So – but the listing auditor is in benign control. Now, actually, benign control is far harder to exercise than very harsh “cop” 8-C. Guy is in-session and doesn't even know it, doesn't even think of being out of session, auditor isn't in his way. It's a little velvet little finger that nudges him back into session when he starts steering out.

Well, we – if the pc is saying, “Oh, God, I don't know, I mean, these pains through my stomach. They're just terrible. I mean, the pain ... Have we got to list any more today? Just one or two more items you know, and I thought a moment ago my heart was going to stop or my umbilical cord was going to go to pieces. Man!”

And you say, “All right, all right, all right. Now, look, we've just got a few more here, so forth. Just got a few more here. Let's finish those up. After all we've got a few minutes left in the session, you know.” That's the way you handle people under listing, see. Persuasion, it's coaxing, it's the old smoothie.

And the way not to handle them is just to sit back . . . “Who or what would want to catch catfish?” And yet you could very easily get into an overwhelm frame of mind. The boisterousness, the behavior of the pc is very often quite overwhelming. The pc all of a sudden goes into conniption fits of one kind or another. The pc's interest is sometimes as burning as a blowtorch, you know? Like somebody said one time, about somebody listing here early on the course. And, “And the pc told me all about – all about spaceships and exactly how they worked, and so forth.” This was a girl that was auditing him that had a well-known antipathy to mechanicisms. “And the pc told me all about spaceships and how they went and how they were built and everything else; and you know, if I'd had the money right there in-session I would have bought one, you know?” They get interested, man!

Now, the only thing that can make a pc disinterested in auditing off these lines is the auditor. The auditors enter something in there.

Now, this is a skill. This is a type of auditing. It has to be pretty well done. It has to be pretty well controlled. The more you interject into an auditing session, the sorer you're going to be. And you just sit there and get them off and keep the pc at it and doing it and you're interested and everything is fine, the atmosphere is fine and the pc is in-session, so forth; man, he'll just go ripping through at a high rate of speed.

And if you sit there stopping him from listing, paying attention to a bunch of Simple Simonisms: he hasn't answered the auditing command, see? He went, “Er – ah – er – game, a game, no, not a game – uh-uh-uh – no, that wouldn't be the item anyhow; a – uh-uh-uh-uh-uh – a person who supervises fish. Uh-uh-uh – no. No, that wouldn't be the item. A person who – uh-uh – a person who – uh-uh-uh – would fish. Uh – no, no, that wouldn't be it. Uh – let's see – uh-uh. . .”

“Well, give me the item. Come on, come on, give me the item. I want the item, see. I want the item.”

“Well, a person who changed ... No, that couldn't be it. Uh-uh – who has no fi – hmmm, hmmm...” and so on.

And the auditor who just sits there and says, 'I must have the auditing question

answered,” see. “Give me the item. I’ve got to get it answered. It says right in the book the question has been asked and it must be answered, and so forth and so forth.” He's just making a mess out of the thing, man. He's got the guy to a point where the guy is invalidate, invalidate, invalidate, and the devil himself couldn't prepcheck the pc back out of it again.

No, the auditor's got to be slippy, got to be clever. He unfortunately due to his own stupidity, has asked one more time, “Who or what would oppose catching catfish?” He was sleepy or something, you see?

And the pc has already been searching for the word, “A game – uh-uh – that wouldn't be the right word. A – uh – a park off – . Uh – no – uh-uhuh-uh-mmm-umm-umm – a – a – a game warden.”

And the auditor has stupidly said, “All right. Thank you very much. Who or what would oppose catching catfish?” See? And then saying, 'I’ve got to get . . . “ having made the mistake, have to compound the felony of making the pc answer the mistake, see. Idiocy.

No, the thing to do is to come off of it and say, “Look, we got lots of items here, I mean, on the line and so on. Just scrub that one. Let's get onto the next one. You know?”

The pc says, “Oh, oh, oh, huh, what's the next one? Who or what would not want to ... oh! Who or what would not oppose catching ... oh, that's all right. Oh! Fishmongers. Fishwives. Safra-su-saf-ru. . .” You get the different aspects? So, you have to tune in. You have to know about this flow thing. And I spent a whole hour talking to you about this flow thing because it's the most important thing in listing. You miss that, you've missed everything. So it is very far from unimportant.

It's the aspect of the pc which determines what you do in listing. Whether you ask for more or ask for less, forgive the auditing command, that sort of thing, smooth him out and so on.

You want the pc listing easily all the time. And a perfect listing session is the pc is just sitting there, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketapocketa-pocketa*. That's all. Next card: *Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketapocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. Thank you. That's all. Next card: *Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. Next card. See? That's a perfect listing thing. Practically no comm lags, pc knows when the line is finished, pc in good communication with the auditor.

And on a very good session that was run today, twelve hundred items were listed in a single session. Interesting, huh? Well, that's fast clearing.

So you've said goodbye, I hope, to two hundred hours of listing to get a goal to clear.

But remember, the one thing that can mess up listing is an auditor who doesn't understand it – an auditor who doesn't understand what he's doing.

He's trying to keep that happy balance. He's trying to prevent the pc from overlisting – he is actually trying to keep the pc from overlisting because pcs sometimes will, see? Or – and he's trying to prevent the pc from withholding items, inadvertently. He's trying to keep out of the road everything in the session. The pc, for instance, all gone wog-wog; auditor doesn't get the rudiments in for his session; the pc then can't stay in-session long enough to remember what items he's supposed to tell you, or he's being distracted by the fact his wife is going to phone him at three o'clock and say whether or not he's been divorced, see? Auditor didn't clean it up, you know. Bad auditing has happened.

And in good auditing you make fast Clears. And the cleverness of auditing takes place in goals finding.

The smooth hammer and insistence and 8-C of auditing takes place back there in Prepchecking, and so forth, see.

And then the clever, reassuring auditor – that's what it takes there in goals finding. When it gets over into listing, that takes benign control. Pc doesn't even know he's sitting on control and he just sits there and spits out items of express train, jet speed. They're all down on the list. Finished. Clear. Free needle on everything. That's all there is to it. It looks very easy.

If anybody is dead against anybody being Clear, though, he won't do it. Don't you see?

Okay. Thank you.