

LISTING GOALS

A lecture given on
30 October 1962

Okay. This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 30 Oct. AD 12 and we are going to take up the subject of listing: its theory and practice and when we say listing, we mean listing of goals. No other type of listing – just goals.

How do you list a goal out? This is a specialized action. How far do you list a goal out? Why do you list a goal out? What happens? What's your target.? What words do you use? Why? These are questions which might plague you.

Now, a goal consists of a bunch of black marbles around a nothing, as you see it, as in the form of the GPM.

Actually a goal (quote) “seen” (unquote), naked and alone, standing by itself, would be totally invisible and totally nothing and totally nowhere and totally no-charge and totally no. It'd be as evanescent as a thetan.

In other words, a goal does not have mass, but a goal in place in the pc's reactive bank is surrounded by mass and the way it looks is a tremendous number of black marbles impinged on black marbles, each influenced by a single postulate.

This is very interesting – very interesting because it has an anatomy. And the discovery that it had an anatomy is of great importance, because it is the anatomy of the reactive bank.

The reactive bank also contains pictures, but these pictures also depend to a marked degree for their force – if not totally – on the GPM itself.

Now, you could take off on a basic-basic of a chain and erase the basic-basic of the chain and get the rest of the chain to fold up. You see this in Prepchecking. Now, that's getting the earliest on the chain.

Now, we see this with a goal. It is the earliest postulate on the chain. And because it is a goal and because it is the earliest postulate on a chain, it then erases – in other words, evaporates. But until it is contacted as the earliest idea-postulate on that chain, it is resistive – resistive in the extreme.

Now, as we look over a bank, we see this phenomena repeated phenomenon is repeated over and over again. If you take an engram, any engram, you can trace the postulate

which occurred before the engram was had. Now, this would be wonderful therapy, except for this thing: that decision or postulate is not the basic on the chain – and the engram itself is not the basic on its chain, so by finding the idea or decision which preceded the engram, you do not achieve an erasure of the engram always, but you sometimes do.

It happens to be an isolated idea and it happens to be an isolated incident. And if the idea is isolated and the incident is isolated, why, then it'll go up in smoke. So we're on the free track basis. The individual has never before thought the interesting thought of, "I'm going to raise hell!" And he proceeds to do so and he never did before and after that he doesn't. Let's say something like this occurred.

All right. That's then a free, relatively free, idea or postulate followed by a relatively independent mass and the two together make a solidity. You have the solidity as far as engrams are solid and you have it preceded by the idea.

Now, you can take any engram or any lifetime or any period of existence and find it preceded by a decision.

You can find the decision, you can ordinarily do something about it. Now, oddly enough, the more independent the decision is from the remainder of the track, the more the thing will read on its own merits, until you walk up to rocket read, which is the total independent postulate at the beginning of an enormous number of actions and ideas and then, of course, you're dealing with clearing and the GPM.

In other words, in vignette in the bank, this can be found and studied. But because you'll never find ... Well I-pardon me, I shouldn't say "never". Because you'll so rarely find a free idea preceding an action and you so rarely find the action free of earlier-similar actions, you wouldn't run into much luck in erasing it. It won't evaporate because it's too dependent on earlier incidents of the same kind.

Nevertheless, the phenomenon does exist and I have seen this phenomenon and I have seen a whole engram and whole series of incidents blow up, just by having found the basic decision that lies before them. And it tends to make an auditor rather weird. You say, "Well now, if I could just do this on every engram, why, I'd be all set." And you keep on trying to do it in every engram and of course the next one is 2,000,765,962 from the first time he had the idea "I'm going to raise hell." That's the number you picked up. Well, it hasn't got a prayer – it hasn't got a prayer of erasing.

And then the incident which consisted of getting shot, see, happens to be the seven hundred thousandth time that he's been shot in that exact place, under those exact circumstances. And, of course, you try to pick this off that late on the chain, it just doesn't erase. So the idea won't go out and the incident, if anything, merely becomes very painful and hangs – hangs up. You can turn on the somatic and it stays turned on. You turn on the idea and the idea remains obsessive with the pc for some days.

Now, look on that as a false goal. Look on that original decision there that decision I was just mentioning there, before he decided to raise hell and then he got shot, you see – take that sequence of events. Well, if you were to run this you'd get, in vignette, the same phenomena as running a wrong goal. It's too late on the track. The incident has been repeated too many times. It won't erase.

The bank, in other words, won't grow less, but efforts to do something to it cause it to increase. Now, in the matter of the GPM, this is a singularity – an oddity – that the basic idea, although it may be influenced by other ideas, is a basic idea. It's a basic idea, postulate, decision – whatever you want to call this thing. Because it is basic on a chain, has a peculiar read which we call a rocket read, therefore, is identifiable. It also tends to stay in consistently and continually without considerable address.

And the incidents which pursue or follow that have little or nothing to do with the previous life of the individual. Now we're dealing, not with an engram, we're dealing with some whacking big piece of track. We're dealing with the trillennia. See, we're dealing with enormous time span.

And the thetan got this idea, made this decision at a time when he could make an independent decision that would stick with that magnitude. And this is pursued by a series of adventures consisting of identities and their oppositions and consists of a whole series of complicated games and goes on off down the line into innumerable side goals, side ambitions, side ideas, side valences. You know, there's terminals and there's more oppterm. And there's more oppterm and there's more terminals and many of them seem terribly disrelated from this original idea.

Original idea: “to catch catfish.” And you'll find in there something like “to be the Lord Mayor.” What's that got to do with anything? Well, you eventually could connect it up, if you cared to. But it actually is connected to this basic postulate or idea.

In other words, we can find in the bank a small picture, in the decision before the engram, of the GPM as a whole.

Now, the individual has lived these lives and in living those lives has alter-ised this goal. The keynote of a goal is alter-is – why it hangs up in mass. If it were purely and completely observed and suffered no opposition and nobody did anything different to execute it than just execute it, why, it'd still be floating free. But because the thing was altered, it developed mass.

And you will find out the first factor of listing is: that listing a wrong goal adds mass. Listing a wrong goal adds mass. That is very important.

And alter-ising the right goal during auditing adds mass.

If you know those two data as the two dominating data of all the listing of goals, you'll

be able to bring off free needles on your meter. But if you neglect either one of those two, you're not only not going to bring off a free needle, you're going to bring more mass to the pc, more discomfort, more upset than he's ever before experienced. We're at that crossroads where auditing must be done with complete accuracy and understanding.

Now, you could probably do Problems Intensives on somebody and never damage him any. You could probably run engrams on somebody and not hang him up with a cold for more than ten days. You could probably do all sorts of things to a pc without messing him up, but for the first time in auditing history we are at a point of data and procedure where the utmost accuracy and excellence is demanded of the auditor or the pc will take a turn for the worse.

Now, auditing the right goal is repairable. If we also alter the goal a bit and make the pc protest and that sort of thing – we can always repair this. Auditing a wrong goal can also be repaired. But therefore, we should know the processes of repair as the first step of listing a goal.

If one is listing a wrong goal, various phenomena, which I won't go into at the moment, will turn on (I've already mentioned them in an earlier lecture). If we list a right goal badly – get a lot of protest and the sessions are rough and all this sort of thing is – everything's going awry, one way or the other – we get a similarity of behavior on the part of a pc. In other words, rough auditing on the right goal – and any kind, no matter how good, auditing on the wrong goal – give us a similarity of behavior on the part of the pc.

So an exclamation point rule is: that you never monkey with the idea of a wrong goal. You never approach this idea; you never run in the direction where this thing – wrong goal – will occur.

You understand, wrong goal: man, that is as wrong as you can get.

That's very, very wrong, because it will beef up the bank, it'll distort the pc's ideas, it'll upset him no end. This is brutal stuff – running a wrong goal.

Now, in that you can audit a – not necessarily you, but somebody – can audit a right goal roughly, poorly enough to give it an alter-is in the process of auditing it, to a casual observation – you could probably study this out and there's more data connected with it – but to casual observation, badly auditing a right goal and auditing a wrong goal are alike. So therefore, we never take any chances on it being a wrong goal; we always treat it as though it were.

You can just mark that down without invalidating the pc's goal for him – which you've seen rocket read and you're very sure of – the thing isn't going right, the thing isn't going right. That's all, man. Nothing is going right. Pc looks worse and so on. You can't get the goal to read well and have a hard time putting it in at the session beginning and a whole lot of sweat and travail on the thing – we just immediately treat the thing as a wrong goal. See, that's your

response as an auditor – not by saying to the pc, “Well, this isn't your goal.”

But finding out if it is the right goal or finding the right goal are both the same action. Do you follow that?

They're both the same action. In other words, we're repairing a wrong goal and we're straightening out a right goal more or less in the same way.

One of the ways to go about this is to just head the pc in the same direction as though you're going to find a goal. Now, what I'm getting down to here – what I'm getting down to, is a minimal number of techniques. In other words, if you go in the direction of unburdening the goal, you'll find yourself very often in the same channel as though you were finding a goal. Do you see? By unburdening the right goal, which you are already auditing, it will read. And if unburdened, a wrong goal won't.

Now, a wrong goal never rocket reads, but right goals very often die out and don't rocket read either for quite a while and then come back in with stuff that looks like Cape Canaveral during a Russian inspection. You understand that to sit there and ask you as the auditor, on this pc, to adjudicate whether you're running a right goal or a wrong goal is asking too much of you. See, that's asking too much because the risk of running a wrong goal is terrible.

So therefore, your technology of unburdening parallels the technology of finding a right goal. They're just all the same technique – do the same things.

So, you have a right goal which can't be run because it's – in listing – because it's running into too much hot water and it won't go in and the pc is having too much trouble. In other words, he can't confront the items that are coming up on it. See, the goal is unreal to him; it won't fire well. I mean, it gets lost – all these kinds of things. I could give you – I could give you just dozens and dozens of clinical studies of whether it is the wrong goal or whether it is the right goal or how to tell this and you look at the left hand corner of the pc's tongue and you find out this. And you could memorize all these things. You become quite expert on the thing. But why do all that if you can say, well, quite normally, “Well, I can't get this pc's goal to fire. They say it rocket read once, but I've never seen it rocket read. What do I do?”

Well, you always take the viewpoint that it is a wrong goal until proven otherwise and then you'll always be safe. You don't tell the pc. You don't have to, because you yourself don't have to decide. You don't have to decide that it's a wrong goal; you don't have to decide it's the right goal. All you do is unburden what you've got – which is a pc.

You see, you never run out of the pc. You run – might run out of goal and you might run out of bank, but these things are invisible to some degree, but the pc is still there. So you got a pc, so the best thing to do with a pc to make a right goal read or to make a wrong goal stop reading, is to unburden the goal.

So actually, when you get right down to fundamentals, you can be as stupid as you want to and you'll never make a mistake if you just follow that one rule.

Can't get the thing to fire. You've never seen it rocket read, and – well, it did rocket read. You saw it rocket read last month, but it hasn't rocket read since. You yourself are getting very doubtful of what you're looking at. It fades out. No Prepcheck that you do on it seems to do it any good. Nothing seems to happen here. Well, just treat it as a wrong goal and go on as though you were going to find a goal.

Now, that would exclude tiger drilling long lists of goals because that's not very beneficial. So the repair method for the wrong goal is the only thing that would contain an address to a wrong goal on the basis of a Tiger Drill.

You can tiger drill a wrong goal and you can bring some relief to the pc. You can clean up a wrong goal and you can bring some relief to the pc, but the best way to clean it up is by Prepcheck – not by Tiger Drill – but by Prepcheck.

So, your first action when you're worrying over somebody's goal – “Is it his goal? Isn't it his goal?” – what – something like this; “And it stays in, and it never goes out. And Joe says he saw it rocket read and it was checked out in HCO Berkeley. I've never seen it rocket read or that one time I saw it rocket read maybe he was thinking of something else.” You know, you get all confused on something – like that. First action: Prepcheck. All that serves is an unburdening action. Prepcheck it.

Don't tiger drill it. You're going to waste hours. I've already put this to the acid test. You're getting stuff from somebody who has done one God-awful amount of auditing along this line, you know. I'm not talking theoretical now. This is hard won data, sweated out in the auditing room.

Basically, it's a waste of time to tiger drill it. If you can't get it to fire in a reasonable length of time by Tiger Drilling – such as twenty minutes, half an hour, something like that – if you can't get that goal to fire, it's a waste of time to go any further. What you want is a Prepcheck.

Oddly enough, on a goal like that, even though you use the most buttons there are, see, actually the Tiger Drill is going to take you longer than the Prepcheck. Because the Tiger Drill is never going to get there and the Prepcheck is going to get there, if it's the right goal. Follow me?

Do you see this?

Audience: Mm-hm.

So it's better to prepcheck than tiger drill. That's your first unburdening step then, is take this thing and prepcheck it. Well this doesn't necessarily take sessions. This might – very well might all get wound up in one session.

All right. Your next action, if it didn't result in a good firing, rocket reading – and don't let anybody come around and say it rocket read a sixty-fourth of an inch, because that in my book – in my lexicon that is not a rocket read. I like to see that rocket take off and strew red flames out behind it for a little while. You know? I like to see a little smoke come out of the meter once in a while, you know.

I like that – you get the goal going along awhile, why, you find it won't rocket read more than about a quarter of an inch or something and it's almost gone and free needles are occurring; trying to get it to rocket read gets pretty desperate. It's almost impossible at that stage of the game, but you've got a free needle now and a down tone arm. You got other indicators. You don't need all this, see. You knew it was the right goal or it wouldn't have wound up there, because a wrong goal produces more mass, which produces a higher tone arm. See. And a right goal, alter-ised, produces more mass and more tone arm height. You see this similarity?

So, all right, we tear along here, we give it a Prepcheck, and at the end of our Prepcheck it's still going *thwp-thwp-phsss! thwp!* Nothing, nothing, nothing – *pip!* Nothing – *stick!* Nothing, *nothing – kkkk!* Tone arm's sitting up here at 4.75. Well, I tell you, you're a mighty foolish auditor to go on and monkey with that. It could be the right goal. Could be the right goal – could be! Nobody's saying it isn't. Don't get into any big argument with the pc. Just tell him you.

not invalidating your goal and you're not abandoning the goal and you're not this and not that and put in the hope factor, which is the true factor.

They get spinny, man, when you don't make this awful clear to them why you're doing this. You depart from the Prepcheck into a further unburdening action and your next unburdening action is to find items. Find rock slamming items – just as though you're going to find a goal.

Well now, I'm not going to give you a long dissertation on how to find goals at this stage, because this lecture isn't on it. I'm just talking about listing a goal to Clear. That's what you do when you absolutely run into it and you just can't make up your mind and you don't know what you're listing and it isn't behaving right, and so forth.

Now, you've got a special goals preparation-cleanup little intensive that goes along with that. And when you're going to haul off and find a bunch of new items and that sort of thing, don't leave all this stuff lying around. Do that October 29th little action as the first action of unburdening and finding items. That gets all the listing that's been done on it and that gets other things, gets it out of the road and it smoothes things up.

So your Prepcheck is your first action. Your next action is an unburdening action. Well, one of the fastest ways to unburden it is that October 29th, 1962 Goals Preparation Intensive. It's a little assessment you do, you know – it's real cute. It's a little assessment and you do

this assessment and find out what you've got to run on this pc and that cleans up some segment of his auditing that probably is the most burdensome and it brings the TA down and some other things will happen. And the pc will find this quite pleasant. They get good gains on this, whereas you saw a pc into just an ordinary Problems Intensive and you're going to have some kickbacks. Pcs don't like this. It isn't going to hurt them any, but they don't like it.

Why? Well, doesn't address their goal. Well, you'll find out that after a pc's goal has been listed for a little while and you're trying to put the thing together, you'll find out that your best bet is to clean up the section of auditing that shows up on that little scale.

You do this little Assessment by Elimination of this little scale on the October 29th bulletin and you'll find you're sitting pretty, because the pc is now really getting audited on the goal's channel. Because, of course, that'll hit the highest mass on the case. See. And, therefore, it'll bring the tone arm down. And you get some interesting results and he still has a sensation of being audited on the – on a goal's channel and he'll feel better.

All right. Now, this action is a preparatory action that permits you to take off – either to find a right goal or to re-prove the goal that has passed. Now, you can go ahead from there and clean it up and find the right goal and so forth. Now, all that knowledge is necessary to the listing auditor before he starts fooling around too much with listing. Because he should know what he's looking at and he ought to know how to repair what he's listed into a hole.

See, so he roughly audited it and it resulted in a high, stuck TA and so forth. Well, he messed it up one way or the other and he can't get this thing to read anymore. Alter-is on a right goal results in a high TA; running, even smoothly, a wrong goal results in a high TA so these are your steps of takeoff and that's the direction you go – and you *don't* keep on listing.

Now, this is a funny lecture when I'm telling you what not to do before I tell you what to do. Don't keep on listing. You do these other things. Got that?

Well, you'll have a lot of happy pcs if you handle it this way because you eventually ... Remember that old goal, remember all those old goals and that sort of thing. Call them out of mothballs every once in a while and read them. Say, "Well, I'm going to check some of these goals, you know," and so on. And you got a new list of goals or something like that. Well, let's check the old goal first. Let's not go and sweat ourselves to death. We may find it's sitting there, *rocket, rocket', rocket!* See? Three cheers!

All right. Now you're set for listing.

So, your first action before you list some pc is to establish the rightness of the goal and if the goal isn't right and the goal isn't rocket reading, to then take appropriate actions either to make the goal rocket read or to find a goal that will rocket read. Got that? That's *vital* to an auditor's know-how. There is no sense in doing anything else.

Don't sit there grinding away on a goal that won't rocket read.

Now, I'm going to tell you why. If'n da goal, she don't rocket read, she too much for de pc.

Once upon a time, he could play marbles with planets. And now a child's marble falls on his big toe and it takes him to the hospital. He's not up to regarding as much force as there is on that backtrack. And you start listing ... This goal temporarily and momentarily rocket read, and oh, you're just fine and you've got this goal and it's all rocket reading, and now you're going to list. Anyway you put lines together you're now going to list this thing, and so forth.

Now, no matter how you put lines together, you have only one purpose in view and that is to undo the alter-is which has occurred on the original goal. That is the purpose of listing.

The purpose of listing is not to read lines to the pc. It's to undo the alter-is on the original postulate on that channel. That is what you're trying to do.

Whatever else you're trying to do, that one you're sure trying to do. Now, all listing methods are more or less adapted to that action – more or less. Some of them are better, some of them are worse. But your listing methods are just based on the undoing of alter-is.

Now, he had the postulate and he wanted to carry it out. This was his goal, his basic purpose. He had the postulate and he assumed an identity and then he was going to carry it out, but his purpose was alter-ised because he ran into a “*wumph*.” And he couldn't go any further because there was the “*wumph*.” So he had to have now a purpose to overcome the “*wumph*” before the “*wumph*” could overcome him and now, therefore, in order to overcome the “*wumph*,” why then he's got to have an ally called a “*bimph*” and he's got to also have the “*bimph*.” And then the “*bimph*” get – he can't be “*bimph*,” because the “*bimph*” has got something that confronts a “*bimph*” and opposes it. So therefore he's got to be an enemy of the “*yip*” and so there he is ... (I don't care what you call these things.) And there is his life, and he sounds like a bluebottle fly in a milk bottle on a hot summer day. You know? Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang.

He's had nothing ever since but an alteration of that basic intention. And the alteration of the basic intention resulted in mass and every time he picked up a terminal that was going to do it, it didn't do it, so therefore, it developed mass.

So we have mass terminals. And these things, as I mentioned earlier, are actual mass and then they're bumped up against alter-ised opposition terminals in his own thinkingness and these confront these, and then those have others that confront those and so on, and they're all in pairs. There are pairs and pairs and pairs and pairs.

Now, there are four basic forces, four basic forces. There's the force out, the force which restrains the force out, the force in and the force which restrains the force in. You can draw these four basic flows. These are the basic forces.

There is the effort to carry out the intention. There is the effort or anything else, to oppose the effort to carry out the intention. There is the effort to retard the effort to oppose the intention and there is the effort to retard the intention itself. There are just four and they can be drawn by four arrows, which are in opposition to – two in opposition to each other and the other two are going away from each other and you've got the vectors that you're trying to list.

Now, the anatomy of this is called a Goals Problem Mass and it's called a Goals Problem Mass because it follows the same anatomy as a problem. You must have postulate-counter-postulate, you must have force-counter-force; you've got to have mass-counter-mass and all of these things hung up.

Now, a problem which goes on with the pc for years and years and years and years and years is actually a mass facing a mass of the pc. If you don't believe this, sometime get a pc who isn't too stone – blind as a thetan and say, “Did you ever have a problem?”

Person says, “Yeah, I really did. I've had a problem.”

You say, “All right, what was the problem?” And he gives you the problem. And you say, “Tell me a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Thank you. Tell me a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Good.”

Well, oddly enough, he will see a black mass go floating away from him he never knew existed. It'll go way out there. Now, we've got him all cured of this, see; he's all cured of this problem. Now, we say to him, “All right, tell me a solution to that problem you just told me,” see. “Tell me a solution to it. Tell me a solution to it. Tell me a solution to it.” He keeps telling you solutions to it. It gets closer, closer and closer – and splat!

You say, “All right. Give me a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Problem of comparable magnitude to that problem. Comparable, comparable – problem of comparable magnitude to that problem,” It'll go way out there again. In other words, you can bring it out – you can push it out, you can get it in – with those two commands.

Although, of course, this problem is just a little old thing, doesn't have anything to do with the price of fish, it's normally a valence of some kind that is parked on the track and the pc is in its opposing valence and he doesn't see its opposing valence and you actually have the two black balls – got these two things impinged on each other.

With the problem of comparable magnitude, you see one of them float off. With solutions, you'll see it float back. It's very mysterious. This was the first basic experiment of demonstration of the Goals Problems Mass. That's why it is called a “problems mass.”

Now, a problem, anatomy of, is postulate-counter-postulate. All the reasons you must solve it, plus all the reasons you can't solve it and all the reasons from elsewhere why it mustn't be solved and all the reasons why they mustn't oppose its being solved.

Now, that's the totality of intentions, if you want to get right down to it, that is connected with this GPM. And you've got two valences, basically: the Rock and opprock and then you've got other confronting valences and. . . Ah, this pc will have had a game going on for oh, I don't know, several billion years, where he was being a farmer and he was being a soldier. And this soldier was against farmers. And you know, soldiers against farmers and farmers against soldiers and he'd lead very unhappy lives as soldiers and then he'd lead very unhappy lives as farmers and there was just this big game that was going on, and he didn't know what he was, and – except in those lives when he was being a soldier he was very dizzy, and in those lives when he was being a farmer he hurt like hell.

See, we could establish which his terminal and oppterm was, but while he was living them, he never really could make it out, see.

And hell have this game going on for billennia. He'll just have gone on and on and on with this silly game. See, as a farmer he's agin all soldiers, and so on. Well, this of course is always a problem to him. And then of course, subsidiary to it are all the problems that a farmer would have. It makes plenty.

All of this is representative in black. Why black?

Well, I can't give you a real good reason of why black, except for this: It is drained-out energy which no longer emanates – this black masses – and it has a timeless characteristic because it is – it's got no more change in it – apparently no more change.

Now, if you were to attack one of these black masses and do something with it – well, old Black and White works – but if you were to do something with it, like try to confront it out of existence – that's a good one – just try to confront it out of existence. All right. “What part of the black mass can you confront? What part of the black mass can you not confront?”

You're just going to wear your voice out as an auditor because absolutely nothing is going to happen to the black mass.

I tore one of them up one time as a thetan, after a great – melted it down and tore it up and I never did so much work in my life, and so forth. And I was horrified to find it was still floating around in fragments. Well, it's non-as-isable in its current state and that's because it's an alter-is of the basic postulate.

See, the basic postulate is part and parcel to every piece of that black mass – no matter what alterations there were to mass, why, there it is. It's going to wind up as a black, drained-out, squeezed-down, crunched-up mass. It's very amusing to take one of these balls and as they're resolving, you will suddenly start seeing things in them – and all kinds of weird things. Thirty-five-millimeter picture slides and all this kind of thing. But actually a whole lifetime of track is all crunched, see.

Got a nice straight time track and when you finish up and you pass in your checks,

why, it all collapses and you've got it. And one day, why, you're being audited on listing and all of a sudden you say, "What the hell is this, a picture folder-card of Niagara Falls or where to spend your honeymoon or ... What is this?" you know.

And like a pc up in London: He really sold the auditor one day. He was a brand-new pc, raw meat – never had anything to do with auditing before. And I've forgotten exactly where this was, maybe it was here. It wasn't here amongst you pcs, but I remember it was a raw meat pc and really gave the auditor a sales talk because a black mass had opened up in front of him. He'd seen through it and he'd seen a city – space-opera city. And he sat there giving the auditor one God-awful sales talk about the fact that it was real and that he had seen it and that it wasn't this lifetime and he'd never seen a picture of it before and he wasn't making it up. You know, that kind of thing. See?

He was trying to sell a Scientologist on past lives or something, you know? Very funny. Anyway, these things shred out into that sort of thing. They unfold and mysterious things appear. When you first see them, why, they're just wound-up masses. In Book One we call them circuits, valences, identities, items – they're all – all those things mean the same thing, see. They'll also talk; they'll also do things; they'll also look like they're God or something. All kinds of wild things occur with regard to these masses.

In listing you run into the lot. If you're listing properly, you run into all sorts of wild phenomena or you run into hardly any phenomena at all. Things just keep melting away, down to the last few feet of film.

Now, all of a sudden, things really start turning up. Guy will go through an overt-motivator sequence: *zzzzip!* You know? *Zzzzip, zzzzip!* And he tried to tell the auditor about it, you know. He'll give the item, tried to tell the auditor about it, "Well, you see, let's see, I was a colonel in this regiment and I had stole this fellow's wife and so forth. And there was a battle the next day and I got killed. It was only poetic justice, because I'd left poison in his coffee pot the night before. That's one overt. Yeah, that's right. That, that. . ." And this is going by – *bzzzzzzzzzz!* Fantastic rate of speed! It's track unwinding. Don't you see?

It isn't the fact that he's confronting it that is causing it to unwind. It's the fact that he's un-alter-ising the basic purpose. You get the un-alter-ises off the basic purpose and the track unwinds. You understand? And then you can confront it. Confronting is a subsidiary mechanism to identifying.

First identification of the rock slam channel results in a lot of items. And these items are very interesting to the pc and they give the pc a lot of cognitions and they blow off and they get him closer to his goal channel. All of these various things are quite important.

But, why the emphasis on finding goals by rock slam? Well, it's what he can't confront. So in listing you must have some commands, that first and foremost, label or identify mass which resulted from the goal – what restrained that goal or that mass, and then what opposed

that mass and then what restrained the opposition of that mass. Now, these factors are vitally necessary in order to get the ball of yarn to unwind.

Now, what confuses the issue is, is there are enormous additional factors. They are just beyond count. The task is: is how many factors can you get away with and still win? That is the actual contest. How few factors do you actually have to handle? I've told you how few, but what do you have to do to handle them?

Now, that's the contest of how you make up lines for listing. It's – you want as few as you need to handle it, that will handle it, see – not as many as you can possibly dream up to handle it.

Now, there's your basic fundamental problem. Because if you don't have ways and means for the pc to identify all these masses as they peel up and come to his notice, if you don't have ways and means by which he can identify them and say what their relationship is to other masses in the goal, why, then of course nothing will happen because the alter-is won't come apart.

That these masses are basically composed of thought is self-evident. That they are manifest is also self-evident. They aren't imaginary masses. But it's thought alone that takes them apart. How come they come apart at all, saying “waterbuck,” you know, “Eskimo,” “cannonball,” “white man”? How come saying these things and recognizing these things takes them apart? Well, that's because they're basically thought derived out of the basic postulate.

So it's the alter-is of the thought and the take-apart, of course, is the straightness with which they're now being labeled. There's always a small amount of lingual alter-is, because you probably conceived the – oh, separate parts of these were conceived in other languages and you're now naming them in English. And there's a slight alter-is of the nomenclature and so on. But that isn't going to do you any harm. But it's absolutely phenomenal that the thing comes apart.

If you think of the number of reasons why it doesn't come apart, why, you're immediately confronted by the fact that it's a miracle that it does.

Now, therefore you're not up against a simple trick. This is not a simple trick. If it were a simple trick, it could have been done many, many times in the last two hundred trillion, you see? And it hasn't been done. You're still here, aren't you? You've still got the GPM, haven't you?

Well, there's many a time that you've exteriorized out of the GPM and made a new GPM. And there's lots of conditions have occurred which made life seem different. There's all kinds of things been occurring. But if you'd been cleared on the track, why, you would go back to that point, you see, as your basic postulate and then that would be very easy from that point on because there wouldn't be anything before that. Well, I think if you'd ever been

cleared you wouldn't have totally forgotten it anyhow.

The upshot of this is, is that listing must permit the pc to easily confront and label the minimal number necessary to cure the alter-is of the basic postulate – minimal number of terminals, items.

Now, thoughts and doingness and significances are not going to get your pc anyplace. He's got to label terminals and things. He's – these have got to be things – things, people, valences, bedsteads and bedspreads and blondes, and catfish and the Mississippi River – don't you see? These are the things you're trying to label. And that you must know, in putting lines together, that you mustn't have significances as possible answers. You're going to get them. Oh, you'll get significances and so forth. But by and large you must have a predominance of mass.

Now, your pc is going to go so far in this mass and then he's going to find out that he can't confront something. This is what happens to a bad goal. Oh, we got this thing rocket reading and everything is going fine and everything – oh, boy, we're – here we go. And all of a sudden, you tiger drill it the next session and it reads less and you tiger drill it the next session and it doesn't read at all. Then it sticks and then it kind of *rrrrr, rrrrrhhh – rraaduuh*.

Now, if you consulted this pc carefully you'll find out he didn't have much reality on this goal or how this goal had influenced his life or anything else. It might be his goal, but he doesn't have – not too real to him. And also the items he's been naming have all been sort of vague. He said “an Indian princess” and “a Turk,” but he just said them. And it didn't – and he didn't have any idea of Indian princesses or Turks. It isn't that he's supposed to get ideas concerning them, don't you see, but they all kind of – well, you know, sort of in a smoke and a dream and they really didn't exist and he didn't exist and he hasn't got anything to do with them. See, his reality factor on these things is very poor.

In other words, he's not doing a very direct confront. His confront on them is bad. Because his confront on them is bad, you're all of a gonna sudden – get into an overwhump situation. And he's going to be sitting there saying, “A Turk. . .”

And you're going to say, “What's the matter?”

“Nec ... Turk. . .”

“What happened?”

PC says, “Oh, I don't...”

“What happened? You tell me,” you know.

“Huh! I don't know.”

He hit something and he doesn't want nothing more to do with it. If you'd been watching the meter, it'd probably do a big rock slam and then that dies out. In other words, he

moved in close to this thing and he doesn't want any more to do with it. And you tiger drill the goal the next time and it's firing less.

Then he hits another section of track that is going all *blluuuh* and he doesn't want anything to do with that either. He says, "An Indian princess, huh-huh-huh. Well, we don't want that item. Let's see, is something else here?" In other words, he chickens out on this stuff. He can't confront it. It's unreal to him. It's not there, don't you see?

These are the liabilities of listing. Sometimes your goal read bright and clear. You got it to read beautifully. The first listing session, it all goes up in smoke. So having a goal and having a goal ready to run are two different things. You can have a goal that isn't even vaguely ready to be listed. But how can you tell? By listing it.

Now, certainly I'd list any goal that was rocket reading. And I'd list to the final hanging dog. First choice: list – with the condition the goal must be made to rocket read at the beginning of the session. And the first choice is list. First choice, make sure you list.

Now, I'd only start doing something about the PC, see, when I could no longer get anything to rocket read. And then I would do something about the PC on the rationale that I gave you in the first instance.

I'd say, well, either it was the wrong goal – which we know it probably wasn't if we saw it rocket read well – or the PC is overwhumped. And the two different situations are gotten out of by the same channel. You've got to over-unburden the thing one way or the other.

And I wouldn't give it an arduous Prepcheck, get it to read, run one listing session, have it fold up, do an arduous Prepcheck, get it to read, do one listing session, have it fold up. I wouldn't go like this, you know. I would think after that had been repeated as a cycle for two or three weeks, that a fellow would sort of get the idea that he ought to do something else.

Well, you've fortunately got another something else to do. That something else happens to be unburdening, and unburdening probably will take many forms. There will probably be a great deal of rationale with regard to this idea of unburdening a goal. It's an old idea, as far as the track is concerned – goes clear back to 53, 54. And I'm not now going to tell you the exact way to always unburden the goal and so forth. I'm giving you the rationale with regard to listing. So don't list one that isn't rocket reading. Prepcheck it. Now it won't rocket read? Unburden it.

If you've been doubtful about it from the beginning, well, for heaven's sakes swamp it all up with the October 29th little intensive and sail on. Sail on. Unburden it as though to find a new goal.

Now, there's – some intermediate step will undoubtedly arise where we get this goal, it rocket reads gorgeously, and then we apply step 79 to it which unburdens it by using the goal.

And you'll probably find something like this being issued: that we list the first three hundred items of "Who or what – " by writing them down. And then we null them and present the first item to the pc on the silver platter. And then we get the opposition item either by listing who or what would oppose this goal, or by opposing this other goal. Always an unburdening step, see. And writing all that down, letting the pc examine this, don't you see, and handing him that item on a silver platter, and then going ahead and keep doing this.

"Who or what would restrain your wanting this goal?" you know, or something like that. And then, you know, list about three hundred items, write them down, and then take and find *the* item in that mess that kicks the pin hard. Get all the charge centered on it. Keep this up for a little while, and then, taking off from that point, you'll find out that listing can just go *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa* according to the cards or the notebook, and there you go.

You can undoubtedly – I can forecast that something like that will be moving amongst you very, very soon. But that would be another action. That would be the action of finding the goal – it rocket reads beautifully – and that is not doing anything with it but unburdening it for the first many items, don't you see. Which all would come under a listing operation.

But then this listing is done by writing the item down and nulling the list. So that's still just a listing operation, don't you see. It's a listing operation that *unburdens*, don't you see? And that makes it very easy for the pc then, and then he finally comes tearing down the line at a hell. of a rate of speed and he lists 18,765 items in one three-hour session by saying them all in Sanskrit, you know? It's *brrrrrrr!* They're all real to him and everything is fine.

Now, some pcs will give you some items with terrific reality. Everything seems to be fine. Everything seems to be wonderful – the thing folds up.

But you understand that is a listing action? You got the goal reading and you list it so you can unburden and list at the same time. That is not the patch-up item – the patch-up procedure I've been telling you about such as: it fades out, prepcheck it, get it back in order, treat it as though it's a wrong goal and go find the right one.

So essentially, you're writing it all down, finding the item on that list. That is just listing a goal out toward Clear.

Now, anything that is listed, whether it is listed by writing it down and finding an item.. . I'm talking about a goal now. You found it; it's rocket reading; everything is happy with it. And we don't care whether we listed with check marks or we listed it by writing them down and nulling out the list and presenting the pc with the item. However you were listing this goal out, the end product is always the same.

You'll find probably the most difficult times of listing come toward the end of listing, not the beginning of listing. And the pc very often would rather be any place else than there. The last couple of days before the first goal goes out are peculiarly trying to the pc, very

often. This has happened – I've observed it several times. They'd rather not have anything to do with it, thank you very much, because they conceive themselves as about to lose the only game in the world.

The goal is “to find pennies underneath the slot grates of gutters in Minneapolis,” see. And this is the only game in the world. There's no other game in the world. These other games don't exist; there's only this one game of finding pennies underneath the grates in the gutters of Minneapolis. Don't you see? And they know now that if they get rid of that, they will have no other game. Games end at that point. Well, of course the reason they can't play any game ... They can't even play that game. They're at a point of no game at all. And until they get that – rid of that goal, they can't have a game.

But they never look at it this way and you could sit and argue with them for some time. And the best way to handle this situation is just make them sit in the chair in front of you and finish it up. But you can very often – will notice – now, this isn't invariable – but you quite often will notice that a pc will use various mechanisms to convince you that you shouldn't go on listing. They do a balk. And beneath it is, “going to lose all games.”

That comes over them. And then they want to know where the goal came from and they get very introverted and speculative, and so forth, as to who gave it to them and why and all this sort of thing and then the thing goes up in smoke, pop, and it won't do anything anymore and that's it.

But you get down to that last period – if your tone arm tends to stay high and that sort of thing, the goal is best prepchecked out of existence, not finally listed out of existence. In other words, it should have – it went free needle and then it kind of froze up and while you were checking around the thing it all kind of got stuffy and stuck up. But you know that it's been listed for quite a while and you saw some free needles on the thing and all that sort of thing; your best procedure to finish off the case is a Prepcheck. A Prepcheck on the goal just as before. Because it blows up all the little residuals of auditing.

Now, auditing itself was slightly an alter-is of the goal and this left a certain amount of alter-is on the track. In other words, you didn't get rid of all of the alter-is on the thing. It was – some of it was overlooked and it tends to blow off in the last Prepcheck. So no goal should be considered a valid goal – a validly cleared up – no goal should be considered to be validly cleared up until it has been prepchecked.

And the best way to test one is to see whether or not you can find a Prehav level for it, not sit there chanting the goal endlessly. Let's see if we can find a Prehav level for that goal. We do a Prepcheck and then try to find a Prehav level and we can't, and we're – got nothing but free needles in all directions and so forth, well, that's good enough. That's the way you wind one up and that's your end product of listing.

And there are probably some cases here that a simple Prepcheck would knock the goal

right out of existence.

Now, here: why are you trying to find this goal and get rid of this goal by lining and get rid of it, and so forth? That's because the pc has no game until that game is out of the road. Now he can have a game. And the next thing is, is so you can get the next goal.

Now, there is no such thing as trying to get the next goal before the first goal is reasonably out of the road. But there is such a thing as overrating a first-goal Clear. Don't try to make it all happen with one goal. I gave a lecture on this last year. Don't try to make it all happen with one item. Don't think because you're going to get an assessment down the list on who or what have you detested, and find out that it's General Pilsudski, that the whole pc's life is going to change. It isn't. It isn't!

It's going to materially better, but it's not going to completely change. In other words, don't try to hang it all on one action. And similarly, don't try to hang the whole case on one goal. Don't try to solve this pc's whole case on one goal. That is idiocy. You won't be able to do it! Because there's a goal back of that goal. There's a whole new GPM sitting back of that. And it can't be touched or monkeyed with till you got the first one out of the road.

Now, you're going to get the second one. And that's going to run off all the alter-is and you're going to find a lot more bank. And that's going to blow and then you're going to find the third goal sitting back of that. And then when you've listed that one – of course, they do list out with great rapidity when you get back that early – and now you're looking at an official Clear.

Three goals listed out – we start hanging medallions around the neck and plumes on the ty-uv's cap. Up to that time, why bother?

There's lots of reasons for that. It's because finding the second and third goal are so much easier than finding the first goal, that you might as well do it.

There's the direction of case stability. First-goal Clear normally has a mighty vague notion of the third and fourth dynamic, let me assure you. It's pretty vague. But they have a darned good idea of the first dynamic. You get a first dynamic Clear.

All right, fine! That's wonderful! But why not push them on up the line? And why not, before you say, “Well, I cleared Bill” – just as he comes out having robbed the bank – why not spend just that little extra time there to find that second goal and find that third goal. Because they're actually quite easy to find. Second and third goals normally should be expected to be found just by tiger drilling a goals list. You make a fresh goals list, you tiger drill it out. You find the goal sitting there someplace. Easily the fastest way to do it.

Now, do you understand what listing is all about? That's what you're trying to do. I hope you're not trying to sit around waiting for Ron to give you the magic list of lines which clear your pc. Because the pc is going to get cleared on the lines that clear the pc, and pcs have

gone first-goal Clears to find their second goal, and have found their second goal and cleared that on four lines. Interesting, isn't it?

You're sitting in an absolute cinch right now. You've got 3GA. You list 850 goals on the bulk of your pcs, you go down that list ... Actually, on any pc, you're going to go clear out to the end of 5,000 goals, you're going to find this pc's goal on that list someplace. And you're going to set it down with four lines and you're going to list it. If it's the right goal, you're going to have a Clear.

My whole interest is speeding it up, making it easier, smoothing it out. Remember, you're working from a cinch and a certainty which has happened. You haven't got time to clear everybody the wrong – long way. So I'm trying to find you some shortcuts. But because I'm trying to find you some shortcuts is no reason you shouldn't use your noggin and realize that it has happened rather well and rather easily on four lines. Okay?

Thank you very much.

Good night!