

3GA GOALS FINDING, PART I

A lecture given on
11 October 1962

Good enough. What is this? This is the 11th Oct. AD 12, huh? The month of the octopus. And Ronnie needed eight hands to do everything he has to do.

We have some good news – some good news. And everybody around Sydney can be very happy with this. Of course, we're always very happy with this. Bill's just found Ian's goal.

Audience: Great!

There are probably some more, but due to the general breakdown in the auditing department, I haven't been informed.

We've stopped – we probably have found many dynamics and items and all that sort of thing, but we've gotten so we don't even announce those.

We have an interesting datum on this: It isn't necessarily true, according to the Auditing Section, and what has been coming through the Auditing Section, that the length of time taken to find the goal indicates the goodness or badness of the auditor. That is not what indicates the goodness or badness of the auditor. It is the fact that the auditor cannot find the detested person, dynamic or item.

Well, according to the statistics, if an auditor can't find somebody's detested person, dynamic and item in a fair hurry, there is something wrong with his auditing. See, if he then doesn't find the goal in a hurry, this doesn't indicate much. See, if it takes a long time to find the goal after you've got the item or something like that, we have no indication of this at all. But the speed of finding the detested person, the dynamic and the item is directly related to the smoothness of the auditor. Now, that's one to put in your kit as an indication of what's going on.

If the auditor can't find the detested person, the dynamic and the item in a fair hurry on the pc, then there's something fundamentally wrong with the auditing sessions. Wherever auditors have been changed on pcs here, why, we've gotten these first three things in a rush. Whereas before, we haven't gotten them in a rush. In other words, it wasn't the pc. Got that? It's the auditor. And this has just been sorted out by Mary Sue, and I think you might find it a useful datum.

Now, to give you some idea, Julia out there in California, is having a ball these days. This is getting ridiculous, you know? I – it is! It's ...

I told her that – to send me a cable – because they were – had a lot of offbeat goals being found out there and so forth, I told her to send me a cable on each one found. Julia's doing all the auditing and I'm getting a cable or two every day. And operating with terrific Saint Hill altitude, don't you see, and operating with the altitude of a good auditor anyhow, she's supposed to be running the show out there, but she's actually the California Goal Finder right now. And she's supposed to be checking out goals.

Something is going here whereby somebody sits down for a rock slam test, and they wind up with their detested person, their dynamic and their item, and then – and the length of time is spent checking out the goal. So they'll spend two hours finding the goal and two hours checking it out.

You're operating here, of course, without this tremendous altitude. You're just a student. And you'll just be surprised how people stand and deliver on goals from the standpoint of altitude. You'll also be surprised occasionally as you're auditing along, how people can stand still and not deliver occasionally. But the general situation is that goals are tremendously variable in length of time to find, even in the hands of a good auditor.

Now, finding goals – this is a lecture on goals – finding goals is a science. It is not an art. It is a science. All of a sudden it's a science. But, like all sciences, it has a bit of luck connected with it.

I'll give you an idea. The pc puts his goal on the end of a two hundred goals list, and there are twelve goals on that list because it's going straight down the line of the proper lineup. Going straight down the line. These goals go out hard. You know, a bit hard. Just a bit hard to get rid of those two hundred goals, you see. And you're just taking them by routine, and the goal is a little bit offbeat from what both you and the pc thought it would be, you know?

And the item is “a target,” to give you an idea – so, of course, “to be a projectile,” you'd say, “Boy that must be the goal, you know?” And you and the pc are both convinced it's “to be a projectile,” you know. And you get down to the two hundredth goal and it's “to be a little flower.” See, you know – a curve in it.

Well, that's why the speed in – with which you find the goal is not necessarily an indicator. But getting up to the goals-finding step, getting the detested person, the dynamic and the item, apparently contains less luck and more meter reading and attention and smooth auditing. These are the factors there. You get over into the goal, and there you are.

Now, sometimes you get unlucky with your detested person. Somebody gives you a list of 420 detested people. Oooh! That's an awful lot, you know, to say, “Consider committing overts against _____. Consider committing overts against _____. Consider committing

overts against____. Consider committing overts against____. Consider committing overts against____ Four hundred and some odd times, see.

Well, that's merely time-consuming because there was a lot on the list. And then this person's apparently a well of dynamics. And we get the detested person, we find out what this represents to the pc, and it represents 610 dynamics. And that's, "Consider committing overts against____." And, "Consider committing overts against____," you see. It's just – it's just hard slug, and so on.

And then we find the dynamic, and we get one thousand items listed from the dynamic, and that's, "Consider committing overts against____. "Consider committing overts against____."

And the phrase is worn out by this time, so you say, "Well, think of committing trouble to____," or something. You see, you – you've actually used repeater technique, and you've just actually worn out the whole English language on the subject of those words. They don't mean anything anymore. Anyway, you see that that is mainly a slugfest and requires good meter attention and requires alertness.

Now, the system is fairly infallible. In your hands I'm particularly proud of this system. It almost works better for you than it works for me. And that's really marvelous. Because on a couple of pcs I've had to take some wide tours. But I recall that this was before the system was perfected.

And then I have had bad luck recently with this system. I've been trying to find goals with it, and here's what keeps happening to me: After I get the detested person and the dynamic and the item, and get the goals listed very nicely – all of which proceeded with great speed – it turns up that the pc had an old goal and it is now alive.

You know, it's just been happening and happening, you know. Of course they got their goal, and that's fine, and it can read now and it never did before and all that sort of thing, but I haven't found a new goal with it, which I consider quite remarkable. Anyway – and then there are some other dodges I've been working on and so forth to speed up goals finding. I've been more interested in the research line than otherwise.

But you know, it's a sort of a disappointing thing, you know, you swear and spit after the session, you know. After you spent – you spent seven hours, you see. And you've just been working like mad, you know, and you've got it all up and it proves up beautifully, and then the pc says to you, "Well, I know you'll practically kill me for this but I think my original goal 'to catch catfish' should go on the front of List Six." Of course, you put it there, and that's it. You didn't find the goal with the system, you found the old goal.

You say, "Aw, nuts!"

But of course, the pcs got his goal, and it's all fine, and it's unburdened, and it's all to

the good, and it's just your own professional feeling of pride that is hurt. You feel knuckleheaded, you know, because it was sitting there in the first place. You already knew about this goal, you know. You worked seven hours on a Dynamic Assessment, and of course the Dynamic Assessment is necessary to make the old goal read. See, it wouldn't have read without it. But anyhow, it feels sort of weird. I think I've done this too often now. And I want to see a brand-new, bright, shiny goal sitting there.

But my research auditing ... You saw a piece of research auditing last night. You didn't see a standard session. You saw a meterless Prepcheck to match up the goal, "to know." And the reason that was meterless is because actually using the meter on the pc to test out the goal, I thought possibly was an invalidation of the goal, so the pc might prepcheck much more smoothly, you see, without the meter.

And I think you will notice that in each case the Suppress fell half a dial, when the pc said there was none. Did you notice that? I was quite interested in that and I thought you would be, too. And the pc is learning it for the first time.

Actually then, the meter knows more about suppress than the pc quite ordinarily. And the pc knows more about the other buttons probably. I'm sorry to have to reveal that. But did you notice that? Did you actually remark that fact? So, of course, there was a meterless check, and you had the pattern of the auditing and it all would have been the same, except I just wasn't using a meter. And we did get someplace with that. And the pc felt wonderful about it.

Ordinarily in another auditing session, not a TV demonstration session, I would have gone through that again. And at that time the pc probably would have fallen into some of these suppresses, see. And possibly would have cleaned it up. But that would have had to have been completed to make a positive statement concerning the fact. The pc thought the Suppress button was cool, and actually it was still hot.

Only for that reason would I be willing then to go on with doing anything with that goal, see. Suppress button's that hot; well, all right. Did you see it though? I mean, did you really see that? It was about a third-of-a-dial drop when he said, "Well, that's clear, and there's not any more answers there," and so on. Now I'll have to run it out of the pc!

But I thought that was interesting. The pc then does not necessarily have any alertness to the hotness of a Suppress button. You notice that none of the other buttons that I noticed, although it was pretty hard to keep the pc on the meter, did you notice that terrific amount of tone arm action? I was always going off the pin, of course, because I didn't want to keep watching the meter because that invalidated the pc. I wasn't able to put that needle back in the center of the dial as often as I wanted to. Did you notice that?

So therefore, you had a hard time following a meter on that at all. And I was trying to get it up to the middle as I said the goal, so that you could see whether or not the goal was firing or not firing. It was pretty hard to do, particularly on the askewness of that

demonstration meter.

In view of the fact that in my own auditing these days, I'm beginning to audit only with the meter over on the left side of me, with a magnifying glass and straight on-auditing with a meter over here, askew with the other hand – getting so I'm ambidextrous. And the Mark V particularly – which I dropped and bunged up a bit last night, by the way – later on. It's all right. It still operates; it's a good test. These meters – the new meter is quite indestructible. There'll be Mark Vs available to you in about three to four weeks.

Audience: Good.

Anyway, let's hope they haven't altered the basic structure from the one you've been watching. It's almost identical face. Face is the same almost. The only thing we did was put “rise” in with the dashes.

Anyway, auditing with the thing over here on this side, and trying to follow that confounded thing through gives you less of a throw. Some of you, by the way, were being – wondering about picking up latent reads – why I was picking up latent reads on this meter. The Mark V is slightly latent. I haven't bothered to inquire why, but the Mark V is slightly latent.

As you think you see an instant read on a Mark IV, on a Mark V you will begin to realize that it is falling at some split second after what you thought it was falling on, on the Mark IV. And that is an instant read on a Mark V. That gives you one answer to it. And the other is, of course, that is what is known as a suppressed meter. And you will often have to do with suppressed meters.

Pc has very heavy suppression. Well, that's proven by the fact that when I asked him Suppress, you'd see your button go and so forth. But that is a suppressed meter. In other words, that meter isn't reading dead-on. A pc with terrifically heavy suppression on the goals line and so forth reads a little early, a little late and so on. This you will get used to. You have to know this.

And it breaks down the rule of the exact instant read. Whenever you have a pc who is under heavy suppression – this'd be a pc who rock slammed like mad, by the way, at half a chance – you'll notice that there's some – often something a little peculiar.

Now, at the time last week that you saw this meter, you mainly noticed the latent reads were being taken on the first rudiment. Did you notice that? That's probably what first attracted your attention. And then it wasn't so latent on the other things.

Well, last night I straightened out the suppressions on the first rudiment. In other words, this pc had several sessions Jammed together on the first one, and we pulled those apart.

Now, you might have thought that was rather unusual to do, but remember it's the

auditor's job to get the rudiment in, not to sit there like a silly idiot and Simple-Simon the pc into the ground. You understand? So I was interested in getting the rudiment in, which I then proceeded to do. And traced the rudiment back to the first time he had trouble with it.

Well now, it was that rudiment – just to make my point here – you saw last night that that rudiment was terrifically suppressed, and a week before, saw that it was reading latent and prior and every other confounded way except dead-on. You see that?

All right. Then last night, I cleaned it up. And I don't think you saw too much else, although there wasn't too much else in the session, because I was running a meterless test. I think you saw far less latent read, although occasionally you did possibly notice that hair-latency, but that hair-latency is the Mark V. And man, you'll have to get used to calling a real latent read, and what is an instant read, on a Mark V. And they're slightly different. It's different than a Mark IV.

There's just a little bit of white space, you might say, in – just a tiny bit of white space in to the end of your statement and the beginning of the read. I don't know why that is, I haven't bothered to inquire, but I have noticed it consistently and continuously. I'm the only one who has been operating with a Mark V. And when you start operating with a Mark V, you'll first start noticing that it gives you a lot of trouble. That's your – be the first thing you'll notice – that this is a lot of trouble, man.

It's like you were running fan-job aircraft, you know, and they're with a fan, and they went like mad, 197 miles an hour, and they struggle into the air, and they fly through the air. And when you first got into one, having graduated from a Tiger Moth, you see, this thing really looked like it was going, you know. Tiger Moth going 60 miles an hour and this thing is going 197 miles an hour.

Well, you graduated from some old type of meter to the Mark IV, and you really thought you were flying, you know, this was really flying. (Probably at the moment perfectly happy with a Mark IV.) And then you start running a Mark V. Well, that's just graduating into jets. You just suddenly and inexplicably will find yourself in the world of jets.

As Mary Sue said the other day, she can't call them. Because it's gone, it's read, before she notices it. You know? The jet plane has gone by overhead and she wakes up to the fact that it has read, you see?

Now, the read is very positive. It's quite a persistent read and is actually much easier to sort out than that Mark IV, but you won't think so at first. I imagine you'll go on stumbling and blundering around for a week or so – I did – and educating your thumb all over again.

You just throw that tone arm up with your thumb a thousandth of an inch further than you intended to, and the Mark Vs needle goes over and hits the pin and lies there. *Haah!* And you've already started your sentence or something like this, you know, so therefore you have

to stop your sentence and put the pc on wait, and adjust the thing, and you eventually will get your thumb educated to where you throw this thing, and it goes over and does a wobble. And you have to get so you can time the wobble.

There's no shunt. That's one of the reasons the Mark V is so terrific. On the actual meter in the Mark V there's no shunt. There is a small one in a Mark IV. And so there's nothing steadying the Mark V at all. And it goes over here and it *wobbles*. And then settles down and gives you the read.

Well, that is the education of your thumb is what that depends on.

Anyhow, that's beside the point, more or less. It has another characteristic: is that when you have a clean needle on it, it flows. That is the most flowing, smooth needle you ever wanted to see.

And let's say you had a flowing, smooth needle – this is another reason for the latency. You had a flowing smooth needle. “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” See, it's flowing, it's smooth, it's nice. It just looks like honey. It's perfect, you know. I mean, it's – everything is just “Oh, my, that's very nice.” And that's on its highest sensitivity or its lowest sensitivity.

You normally run this on its second sensitivity – a Mark V. You run a Mark V with the additional sensitivity knob straight up, which I think is sensitivity 64. And you're running right now at sensitivity 16. There actually is that difference of multiple in the sensitivities.

So anyhow, it runs best with that sensitivity knob straight up, and you get your best reads out of it. And only when you're trying to pick the pc to pieces do you shove it over to a 128, see. And there it is, flowing smooth, and you say, “Now, when was the last time I audited you? When was that session? How? Yes. Well, fine now. Thank you. And since the last...” and this needle goes *krup-krup, tuk-tuk, prr-brr-brr-brr-brr* – gone.

Now, it actually kind of doesn't matter if it reads or not. This is a bad thing to tell you. You know there's something on the question. In other words, you can use this flow factor on a Mark V. You no longer have a flowing needle. There is something wrong with the question you are asking. And when you clean it all up you'll have this beautiful flowing needle back. And it's very easy to get it back.

But you can almost tell what question is hot by the fact that the needle is doing something, or that you have missed something in the session. Something is missed in the session. You can tell it from the unflowingness of the needle. It's going up in jerks. It's going up, *bup-tek, krrp-bump, dit-du-bop, zzt-zzt, trip, thud*. You know? It actually is very commotional. In other words, the Mark V to some tiny degree registers the state of mind of the pc by its character of rise. See?

Now, the Mark V also picks off all analytical thoughts. There isn't anything left in the

pc's skull when the Mark V is clean. See, we were with the Mark IV picking off reactive thoughts only, and the pc could think an analytical thought and you wouldn't see it on the meter. With a Mark V you see every analytical thought.

Pc says, "Well, I hope that doesn't read." The Mark V will go click! So therefore, you heard me asking, and have heard me asking while you've been watching me do this, if the pc thought of anything, if there are any afterthoughts in that particular case. And it wouldn't matter if the thing were very latent, I would still ask the pc what he thought of.

Why? Because I don't want my needle *brr, brr, brr, tick, tick, brr, thup, bup*.

Now, actually every analytical thought is to some degree a missed withhold, if it is not uttered to the auditor. So if you want the pc – without pestering him to death – if you want the pc really sitting in-session gorgeously, so forth, why, you've just got to keep a clean flowing needle. So this gives you something new that a meter can do. Right?

Now, this is very pertinent to goals finding. Because you're not about to find any goals on any pc whose rudiments are out. You're just not about to find any goal on a pc with the out-rudiments; that's all, man. And the Mark V puts rudiments in the like of which you never heard of before. You really get them in. You get them in including the analytical thoughts.

In other words, you get it in reactivity and analytically and physically

and every other way. You've got these rudiments in. Of course, you won't get them in as well if you are suspicious of your meter. And if your meter is not quite registering everything that it might be registering, therefore you'll very often badger your pc and start cleaning cleans. And that throws the rudiments out.

I know I had a bad time in the session last night. I got into the rudiments, the pc was out of session, I couldn't get the rudiments in, and we had quite a ruckus. Quite a mess. Auditing table upset and everything. This was remarkable.

Now, when this type of thing occurs it is – something else has happened.

And obviously I just got through missing the pcs goal. I think that was what this was all about. I couldn't really trace it to anything else. I must have gone right over the top of the pc's goal. Needle was rough and registering on "half-truth." But I think it would have registered on "Have you eaten any apple pie?" There was a lot of figure-figure going on. There was a lot of this and that going on.

So the meter is actually more sensitive than – for everybody's good, occasionally. You see, it's – you could get along with less. Do you understand? But yet you actually can't get along with less.

So this meter delivers back to the auditor a tremendous amount of skill in the order of auditing. It delivers back to him a lot of judgment about the thing. Is this pc doing all right, and

is this pc really in-session? Well, you've got a free-flowing needle.

Now, the only thing wrong with that is you also get a free-flowing needle on a totally ARC broke pc, whether you're using a Mark V or a Mark IV or any other thing. I saw that last night, too.

See now, what's the point here? Well, no meter is ever going to be made, ever, which lays aside the ability of the auditor to perceive the pc. The auditor must be able to see the pc. The auditor must be able to apprehend what the pc is doing. Because he could then have a free-flowing needle on a totally ARC break pc with nothing registering anyplace.

Now, that factor will always take place because it's a characteristic of a living being; it is not a characteristic of a meter. And there's no beating that factor. I assure you of this; there's no beating that factor.

So you always have two inspection systems at work. You have the auditor, and you have the meter. And if you delete either one totally, auditing doesn't become more difficult, it becomes *impossible!* That's with an exclamation and an underscore. You delete either one of these systems, and auditing becomes impossible.

Now, when I say "When you delete the meter," you of course couldn't find the pc's goal. I worked and worked to find a system which would meterlessly find the pc's goal, and I have never succeeded in doing that. I don't even have a clue as to how to go about it, because everything – and I mean that everything I have put together that pointed in that direction has flopped. In other words, there has not been one hopeful sign.

Now, how do you like that? Now, you know you get on some goals channel with the pc, and if you're on the goals channel, it – occasionally a goal will go *zzzpp!* and occasionally it'll rock slam, and occasionally will go tap, tap and a rocket read, see, as you go over one goal or another. You know that's a hopeful channel. All right.

There's been no hopeful channels of any kind in the direction of ... Well, for instance, writing up a list so that the pc would eventually write only his goal. You get the type of thing here? Writing up combinations of lists which would eventually get the pc to write his goal. Doing this or that, asking questions of, and so forth. And this has just uniformly laid an egg.

I don't say that it's an impossible trail, but I do say that in quite some period of time now, two years, I have occasionally moved into that field and worked in it. And every time I've come out with a total skunk, pockets empty and all shells intact – skunked.

I've thought of how about having a pc just write goals until the only goal he can think of is that. That doesn't work either. Pcs can evidently write eight million nine hundred and ninety-nine billion goals without ever only writing their own goal, you see. Well, a lot of – lot of things go into this.

So, goals finding begins with auditing. And it requires an auditor capable of inspecting

the pc who is being audited – the auditor inspecting the pc and an instrument inspecting the pc. It takes *both*.

Now, sometimes you can lay the instrument aside but that's only when you're proving something up. You'll eventually have to bring that instrument back into your lap and say, "Does that goal read?" Do you see? You eventually have to resort to the meter, no matter how many other approaches you make visually with your naked eye.

Now, your meter is not going to detect the ARC break of the pc if it happens fast. That's interesting, isn't it? Only the auditor's going to detect that.

And after that, the meter says, "It's all clean, it's all clean, it's all clean." The pc is lying on the floor, writhing quietly, see. The meter says, "He's well." The meter says, "He's well and happy and in-session." You see, "Have I missed a withhold on you? Huh-huh, clean. Willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Clean. Do you have a present time problem? Clean." See? "You told me a half-truth? Clean." Everything clean, everything clean, everything clean. Pc's lying on the floor in total agony and total despair.

So therefore, not this instrument, but any mechanical observer I think that anybody ever cooks up will have some ceiling of limitation on its power of observation. There'll be some limitation upon its ability to observe, which a thetan can always better. Because remember, a thetan can look, but a machine can't look unless a thetan is looking at the machine to read the answer off of the machine. This is something that the scientist uniformly overlooks.

The psychologist's dissertation on how the eye works is one of the damndest pieces of buffoonery which has ever been perpetrated as a hoax – I mean, as a fact. It is! It's a piece of buffoonery. According to this, the eye looks out here, it points in that direction, and by some focal system of images – which of course he gets out of the science of optics – there is some kind of a screen back here which registers the image. And then we don't say any more about it.

But carrying through this, *reductio ad absurdum*, we get a screen looking at a screen and then we would get another screen looking at a screen.

And then we'd get another screen looking at that screen, and another screen looking at that screen. And at no time anywhere do we have an observer. In this whole system there is no observer. I think the reason for this is the psychologist has never been able to observe. So he just discounts this very necessary thing, an observer.

You know, I did this one time with a UNIVAC, ENIAC smick-smack thingamabob whatnot that was going round and round and its wheels were churning, and its valves were popping, and I think it had cooling systems and so forth to cool off its fevered brow. And it had all kinds of instrumentations which crossed instrumentations.

I busted the machine by the way. I did. I fed it “two times two equals . . . and it was unable to solve this problem. That was the end of it. The things went round, and they went round, and there was no 'W' to fall out, see?

It was set up to have a more complex equation. And that was too fundamental an equation. Now, it could have said, “Two times two equals four,” if you had first said, “The derivative integral of Y in its ratio to X is the distance between G and its square root of Q. And if this were true, then two plus two or two times two equals what number?” See, the machine is set up to take that many.

This just left all the blank files over here, see. And the machine looked in vain, it couldn't find anything there, so it looked again. And couldn't find anything there. And it looked again, you see, and it never would pick up the “Two times two.” The cams were going mad inside the thing. They had to shut the thing off.

Spoke to me rather crossly. And they said, “This machine was not designed to solve things of that character.” It was an astronomical computational machine. It had the distances to the moon, and the lunar positions thereof, as expostulated from the eclipse of something or other, you know, and this was all fed in. And of course the cams couldn't “Two times two equals four.”

“Well, let me point out something,” I said. “Let me point out something here. The machine never has seen an answer.”

“Ho-ho-ho-ho, nah-ha-ha-ha, nah-ha-ha-ha, nah-ha ... !”

I said, “Wait a minute now. That machine has never seen an answer.”

“Well,” they said, “seeing you're just using some offhanded trickery or ... It's your writing background showing up, you know, just using semantic trickery, or . . . “

“No, no. It never has. Who reads the answer when given up by the machine?”

“Well,” they said, “the operator.”

I said, “Then the operator is part of the machine.”

“No! No, no. No! No, no.”

“All right, then if the operator isn't part of the machine, then the machine has never inspected the answer.”

“No, that – couldn't be true.”

You see, that just led up the garden path on this. You had – you put an observer into any of these systems and they go to pieces. You've got to have an observer. I mean, you take the observer out, you say to – here's this system. And it says, “Well this machine observes itself and therefore integrates what it does.” Well, you can set up a machine as a

servomechanism which will find out that it's nine o'clock and shut the radio off or turn the percolator on or do all kinds of things like this. But its inspection is just that. And actually it rarely inspects that it's done it.

Now, some machines, much more complicated, will inspect to find out whether or not it has done this. And if it hasn't done this it will shut itself off. An automatic phonograph will do that. It'll inspect itself to find out whether or not it's playing a record and therefore ... But its inspection is limited to that one sphere, see. It can observe no further than that.

Now, you cant expect a meter to observe a pc. It will not. An auditor has to be there to observe the meter. And I'm stressing this point not because it's just a piece of ridiculousness, but you're going to find people around who think that the machine observes the pc and if they simply sit there and let this machine operate, they're going to be all set. And furthermore, that a machine can be developed which will observe the pc 100 percent and do everything there that is present in an auditing session. So their total action will be to develop better and better and better meters. The auditor is totally unimportant. See, the auditor will have nothing to do with it at all. It's just whether or not you have a better machine.

No, sir! Although it's very laudable to develop better and better and better meters, don't develop in them the direction that they will eventually wind up with no auditor. Because that's the trouble with any auditing session that goes wrong: is no auditor. At some point in the auditing cycle there's no auditor.

You can actually have the commands come out of a tape recorder. See you could actually fill up a whole record – a whole tape full of “Do fish swim?” And then put it on with a foot pedal, and sit there and the tape will play and ask you the question, “Do fish swim?” and so forth, and then you get into an ARC break.

Well, maybe then you could have another tape recorder and if you had an ARC break you could take your other foot and push down on it and it would say, “Do you have an ARC break?” See? And maybe if that registered “yes,” you could even link that in to another machine which now said, “All right, recall an ARC break” or something, you see, and it would go on and on and on in this particular fashion.

In other words, you could get a system of complexity operated out like this. But look, no matter how many systems you have, the only observer present is the pc. So you still have an auditor present. It's the pc auditing himself. Now the question is what is he auditing? And if your observer is the pc, then what's the pc auditing? Well, he must be auditing some valence. Well, we're not trying to clear valences. We're trying to clear pcs.

All right. Now, let's study this a little bit further in goals. It becomes much more pertinent to this than it appears at first glance. The pc must have another beingness. This is peculiar to goals. You realize you can sit there and chant to yourself, “Think of a problem of comparable magnitude,” and think of the problem of comparable magnitude to something or

other, and solve something. You could even audit yourself through an engram. You can do all kinds of interesting things with self-auditing. Most of them wind you up in the soup, but the point I'm making out here is things can happen because of self-auditing, see? You can.

You're having an awful lot of trouble with some other human being; you can sit there and say, "Well, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to Bill." See, "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude to Joe. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude to..." and get your answer each time, and first thing you know you feel better about it. See, that's possible. Of course, you'll probably have a headache and so forth. But it doesn't matter.

Now, it's possible. Now, because *that's* possible – because *that* is possible – then you could extrapolate and move forward to believe that goals finding and auditing was possible. You see?

In research and so forth I've had to, and have inadvertently or on purpose, run dozens of processes on myself. It's inevitable. You say, I wonder what would be the effect of . . .?" See, that's all you have to say. You answer the question. It's obviously a self-audit, see?

You say, well, would these people get better if you did so-and-so? Supposing you asked them, "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Well, think of a problem of comparable magnitude to this building." "Yeah, there's an answer. That's answerable."

Now, in actual fact, you, in dreaming up a pcs lines do a little bit of self-auditing. You say, "Well, let's see, is that answerable, or isn't that? Yes, you could say that'd be a clear sphere, or something like that. Yeah, there's an answer to that." You know? So, you get this kind of thing.

In other words it starts to be borne in upon you that auditing on self is possible. Well, it's possible to say, run a Touch Assist on your own leg. Yeah, you could probably cure up a sear.

Girl's got a scar or something like that, that she doesn't like, on her knee or something like that, why, she could probably do a Touch Assist on it ten minutes a day and at the end of a couple of months or something like that have no more scar. It's quite remarkable what can be done with a Touch Assist, see. And because that is successful, say, well, you could probably find and run a goal on yourself, see. Therefore goals running is possible.

Now, I collided with – on this on the *Queen Elizabeth*. And I've had a quite a go-around on this particular subject, and actually have let some people list their own goals. And this is what now materializes: Let me show you here: here's a person, see, and here's a valence. This flashlight, see. Now, here's the valence here. Now, this is the valence with the goal in it. Now, to find his own goal – see, you'd think it'd be like this, see – he said, "Let's see, 'to catch catfish.' I wonder if that is my goal. Let's see. Is that my goal? 'to catch catfish?'" Sen.

“Now,” he says, “I don't know, that sort of made me feel dizzy. Let's see, 'to catch catfish'. . . How about, 'to be a game warden?' Yeah, there's pain on that. That must be right.” That's the oppgoal. See? That's the oppgoal. An individual has to be over here to look at the valence in which his goal exists. I'm making this point with you. And every time the individual thinks of inspecting his goal he exteriorizes from his valence into an opposition terminal. And an effort to run one's own goal or list one's own goal always finds one in the opposite lines.

Now, when one is listing opposition terminals, one of course is in one's own goal terminal. Here's the opposition terminal, see, and the thetan would come around here. Let's say these are terminals now. We'll take the terminal situation, see. And here's the thetan, see. Now, this one contains the opposition goal – the flashlight. And this little microphone here contains the person's own goal, see.

Now, person says, “To catch catfish. Who or what would want to catch catfish?” and inspects – goes over here to the opposition terminal, to inspect the terminal which contains the goal “to catch catfish.” Savvy?

Now, to inspect the opposition, “Who or what would oppose catching catfish,” the person goes into the terminal in which the goal exists to look at the opposition. Do you understand?

In other words, no matter what he looks at, he is always in the other side. Every time he looks at the goal or the Opposition to the goal – there's looking at the Opposition – he's in the terminal with the goal. You got that? And while looking at the goal he goes into the terminal which is in Opposition to the goal. You see this?

So there he is, always on the wrong side of the fence, because – here's the trick: you cant as-is. You're always being the thing – you're always being the thing which doesn't have in it what you're trying to as-is. It's all exterior inspection, then. Everything is inspected exteriorly in the mind. A little bit hard to put this across.

But the point I'm trying to make simply is that the individual, the person, the thetan, in the bank stack-up, can never be in what he's trying to audit. And therefore never turns the sen or the pain on in the right places. It's always in the wrong place.

If it's lines two and four that are supposed to contain sensation, and lines one and three supposed to contain pain, why, in a self-audit, why, lines one and three will contain sensation and lines two and four will contain pain. This is real backwards, isn't it? And he can get so loused up, because he never is in what he is trying to as-is.

He star – he's going to check out his own goal. Let's say the goal is in this microphone, that's one valence, he's going to check out this goal. So he comes over here into the Opposition to check out the goal. Now, he's being the Opposition while he's checking out the goal, but this thing isn't here ... He's not in it to find out how it thinks, so he only thinks over here in the

Opposition, you see what this ... You get the idea?

Now, he's going to check out for the opposition goal; of course, he's in his own terminal and, you know, the one that does have the goal. No, it takes an auditor.

All right. Here's let us say is the auditor. And here are two terminals. Here's the auditor, and the auditor says, "to catch catfish," and the pc goes into the terminal of "catch catfish." And the auditor says, "Who or what would oppose catching catfish," and the pc goes into the terminal in opposition to catching catfish, see? In other words, he's in the right terminals for them to as-is. And so you get as-isingness. Then you get something as-ised and the bank starts caving in and he's always in the right viewpoint. But self-auditing he's always in the wrong viewpoint.

Because of this mechanic alone, self-clearing becomes impossible. Also, after a great deal of testing and so forth, although a person could get away with it if his auditor was sufficiently powerful and stood over his head enough and had written the lines up and so forth, for a little while the person could self-list. But he's actually not self-listing; he's listing on a – he's just writing things on a list that was given to him by another person, don't you see? And even that one, as in the main, failed – self-listing.

I've just received a plea from Wing Angell who took somebody with self-listing, and he says, "Please, please, please, no more self-listing, please!" He had to mop up the pc, you see? The pc was going into the wrong terminals. And after a while the pc gets so confused they don't know whether they're coming or going. See what happens?

It's just the fact that a guy on a self-audit appears in the wrong places to self-audit on goals. I hope you understand that.

Audience: Yes.

You got to have an auditor out here. And the auditor asks the questions; the pc goes into the proper places to get the as-iness of the situation. Therefore, your auditing occurs. And he gets the pain in the right places and the sensations in the right places and his viewpoints in the correct spots, and it all starts going, and that's it.

Well now, he starts looking for the goal "to catch catfish," he at once will exteriorize from the terminal in which the goal "to catch catfish" is residual. And then thinking quietly to himself will realize that his goal is "to be a game warden." He'll pick for himself inevitably while he is looking for his goal, only opposition goals. This gets pretty fantastic.

If you inspect most terminals lists after you've . . . Let's say the first 850 goals list – which is still done, by the way – that list is quite remarkable for having on it so many opposition goals. It's got lots of them. Well, that's something that the pc listed himself.

Now, something that is listed on the pc by an auditor is less likely to have opposition terminals on it and contains a greater preponderance of his own terminals, see? This doesn't

necessarily hold true because sometimes a pc is so spattered into his item that he cant tell the difference between the item's goal and his own goal. See, they're smashed so close together, you know?

Had an example of that the other day, you know. It's quite remarkable. The lack of criteria the pc had between his own goal and the goal that would belong to the item. You've noticed that in doing your lists sometimes, you know.

Let's say the goal was "to catch catfish," you know. "To catch catfish," "to bite hooks to jump out of the water," see, "to eat well," "to never be scaly again." You know? You watch these lists and you will see that the pc is actually putting down opposition goals. But that's on the item. And of course, when you haven't got any item in sight the pc rackets around inside of his bank, and so on. He will put a large number of opposition goals.

That's perfectly all right, because they won't rocket read and everything is fine. You never find an opposition goal with rocket reads. Don't worry about that. Some of you've got it tucked away in your head that some goal is firing, and it's the opposition goal, and you're now very worried.

Aw, stop worrying about it. Some goals will continue to fire for quite a while and then fold up, which aren't the pc's goal. You should be aware of that mechanism, but it isn't that they are opposition goals. And opposition goals won't keep on firing forever, see. That's very nice. You're saved by the bell. In the normal checkout period an opposition goal folds up, and it doesn't rocket read.

But sometimes you'll get other goals rocket reading when they're quite close to the real thing. And then it fades and the rocket reads fade. And apparently a rocket read can – the reason – any goal but *the* goal rocket reads is because the read can possibly – and this is just suppositional – transfer to another goal. And it'll stay transferred to the other goal for a short time.

That's a supposition drawn from the fact that the rocket read will transfer from the goal to the line. Just as you can get a line rocket reading, so you might be able to get a very closely associated goal rocket reading for a very short period of time. And that accounts for your occasional rocket reads.

You're going down the list, and you get this one, you saw one on TV one night. And it was something, I think, "to be dashing." And man, that thing really rocket read. You remember that? It's a long time ago. And it really rocket read. It rocket read, it rocket read, it didn't rocket read, and it didn't rocket read, and it didn't read at all, then that was it.

Now, where'd it get that rocket read? Actually it was a transfer to the goal momentarily, and the goal itself was in there someplace, see, and it was firing, and then this thing blew off the top of it and it wasn't the goal and so you no longer had a rocket read.

So, because your opposition is so close to the goal, occasionally opposition goals will rocket read momentarily. But not for hours, you know. And they don't check out. And they don't live up to anything. So you don't worry about opposition goals. It's not an obstacle.

The only thing I'm trying to tell you here is self-audit is impossible on goals. That's just it. I just have to come to that conclusion. There is no system by which you can self-audit into your goal.

Of course, you wake up some morning – you can wake up one morning and you can say, “My goal is ... !” Well, fine. Fine. My God, for all means, put it down on something even if the inside of a matchbox, and give it to your auditor. If you notice, as you tried to tiger drill it on the way to school or something – if you notice – it got only sen. And it got kind of unreal. And it got kind of fogged up, and so forth.

That's because, of course, you had to become the game warden, or you had to become something else, or you had to become the catfish, see, and then you're on the wrong side of it, and it's a valence problem, see? And you slide into the wrong valence and after that it doesn't work. And that's goals. So it takes another observer. The machine cannot observe. It takes

another observer in the session. And somebody who can sit there and issue the actual commands to a degree that a person does not self-audit to find goals. Therefore, it takes very smooth, fine auditing to find goals. Your auditor has to have presence. The pc has to *know* there's an auditor there. Otherwise the pc is just mucking around from – in the wrong valences, and self-auditing into this and into that, as he would do on a machine.

So it takes a machine to do detection. The human being doesn't go that far. The thetan doesn't go that far on observation. But the machine will never be an observer. And as the machine cannot be observer, then a human being would never be in the right valence to find the goal. So that's why you have to have a fine auditor to find goals. And the more presence, and the more altitude, and the more certainty the pc has on the subject of that auditor, then the easier it is to find the goal. You follow that?

So the better the auditor, the easier it is to find the goal. And the weaker the auditor, the harder it is to find the goal. But the goal – the length of time of finding the goal, as I said, depends to a large degree on luck. But finding the item, finding the detested person, you know, finding the dynamic, finding that trio – of course, if the auditor has good presence, good skill, the pc's aware of him, they go into it, *clank!* and go outside of it, and say, “That is detested,” go into the next item, *bang!* They say that is detested, go outside of it, go into the item, *bang!* That is detested, there it is, *bong!* And you've got it. You understand?

In other words, the auditor's presence is sufficient and adequate to putting the pc into the valence necessary to face the valence which is the opposition. See? So it takes an auditor. The auditor is necessary. The machine

is necessary. We can make better auditors. We can make machines. But we can't, I don't think, make an auditor that will totally replace the machine. And I know that we can't make a machine that will ever replace the auditor. Do I make my point?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.