

R2G SERIES

A lecture given on
21 March 1963

Good evening. How are you? This is the 21st of March, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Okay, well, how are you? Oh, that's-that's good. That's good, fine.

Well now, this evening's lecture concerns the 2Gs. The 2Gs. Routine 2Gs. And this lecture is an off-the-cuff lecture about these very valuable processes, but the first announcement on it that has some importance is that goals finding-goals finding-not goal running-goal finding becomes a Routine 2 process.

Now, why is that? Probably startles you a little bit, but the reason for this is that the most therapeutic and the least dangerous auditing that you can give anybody is finding goals. That's very interesting, isn't it? In other words, the most unlimited-up to the point of finding his goal, of course-and least dangerous process is goals finding.

Now, if you do something with the goal, that becomes very horrifying if it's the wrong goal. You-you understand that? That-nothing has changed about that at all. But because things were so terrible and so grim and so awful, and pcs caved in so hard when you ran them on a wrong goal, our tendency up to now has been to safeguard goals, just as an identified subject. Just safeguard goals, you know? And that's been the-an identification. But actually there's nothing, nothing dangerous at all about finding goals. And therefore, it is quite safe to put goals finding in the hands of the most amateur auditor. So he goes over the goal. So he leaves the goal behind him. Well, so the pc will ARC break. But we can even teach him this datum.

Now, that's about the only dangerous thing that will happen in finding goals. It's running goals that is dangerous. You take a wrong goal and run it, and you'll wish you hadn't. Therefore, with this distinct proviso that one must not run the goal he has found, a Routine 2 trained auditor is now authorized to find goals.

You see, something funny here has happened. Something very remarkable has happened. It takes, now, much more time to find the goal in some cases than it does to run the goal. And some goals are very, very hard to find indeed. And a great deal of preliminary work has to go in on the case and so forth, so this puts a tremendous burden on Saint Hill auditors.

Well, their function-a Class IV Auditor-of course is to check out goals and to see that they get run properly, but when you give them the whole burden of finding goals, and they

have no assistance in finding goals at all, it puts an immediate ceiling on the amount of service which a district office, a Central Organization or a field auditor can provide.

Now, goals finding can be taught, and you find that it's quite simple. It doesn't mean, however, that it is easy to find a goal. That is to say, "It is easy to find a goal on every preclear." This-this is not the message. It-on some preclears it is very, very far from easy to find a goal.

But let's look at it this way: The actions now entailed in finding a goal are relatively easy. All you have to do is do those actions and you will find somebody's goal.

Now, it may take-it may take hours, but that's unlikely-more likely tens of hours, and in some cases weeks and weeks and weeks, and in some cases months, to find a goal. This is -this is according to our findings on this. But this, of course, makes it very feasible to turn loose HPAs/HCA's onto the action and operation of finding goals and getting them checked out and so forth.

Now, you notice there's been very, very little released on the subject of finding goals here for the last few months. I've actually been working on processes which found goals. And in working on those processes, I've made some interesting discoveries, and some of those discoveries are very oversetting to some of the older things which we believed.

Such as this: The first one I gave you, that you can go on finding goals and trying to find goals and trying to find goals, and you deliver more gain auditing to the pc than in doing anything else. That's interesting, isn't it? You'll do him more good than even a Problems Intensive. And that's rather considerable.

So what-what do we-what do we find ourselves with, here? The necessity to codify goals-finding processes and reduce them to a very precise activity that can be taught, and make those processes relatively simple, and train people in them. Now, they're about to teach some HCS Courses in the United States, and I think about as far as they'll get in teaching these is teaching somebody to find a goal.

Now, this discovery that goals finding is the least damaging and the most therapeutic-short of clearing- auditing that a pc can have, winds us up with this consideration: that we should have a series of designations which are simply goals-finding designations, and include in those everything that we do on the subject of finding goals. And use in them everything that is of use and interest on this subject.

Now, a Problems Intensive has never had a designating number. It was just a twenty-five-hour intensive that they found would be of some use. Now this-this intensive, this Problems Intensive, we have to include in our general, overall scheme of things, so long as it is problems that we are addressing in that. But in actual sober fact there are a few pcs that you will find around that, the moment we address this Problems Intensive wholly and

completely to the subject of goals, will plow in, just like that. Why?

In other words, we'll give some pc a Problems Intensive that is addressed in the direction of purposes, you know, and we give it across a span of time. That is to say, we say, "Since 1950, has-how has a purpose been suppressed?"- something like that. Well, unfortunately we're going to find that some banks are messed up. The person possibly might be living his second GPM in his present time existence. In other words, he already-he has sort of suspended efforts on the first GPM and he isn't increasing that, and he's in actual fact sort of living in the second GPM.

In other words, it's been terrifically restimulated, and the more we run Problems Intensives on a period of time having to do with present time, you understand -present time-the more we have to do with present time on this person. You know, "In present time" "On this problem" or something like that, or "On this purpose has anything been suppressed?" -why, the better off we'll be at large.

Now, this doesn't mean that it wouldn't operate on many pcs and so forth, but in view of the fact that it, on a few of them, it won't operate, that is enough to sweep away a time consideration with regard to a goals-type Problems Intensive.

You probably don't completely grasp what I'm talking about, and some of you-one of you had a new one going the other day. You give me a hard time, you know, trying to catch up with you, you know? You-you-as the one you got going out there now, I mean not "you," all of you -just -just -just you-there, that's sitting in that chair there. "It read for me, it rocket read for me, but it doesn't rocket read for the Instructor." 1 -1 -that's -that's the sort of thing we get going.

But on this matter of the first GPM and the second GPM, we'd better clarify. We mean the first GPM contacted by the auditor. We cannot number the GPMs from the year 200 trillion years ago-the year zero, in other words-we can't number them forward as the first GPM, the second GPM, the third GPM, so forth, because we don't know how many there are-so therefore we could never number the present time GPM.

Now, the case is entered at the present time GPM, the one he is in now, and that is the first GPM. On some cases, however, the present time GPM is the second GPM-the person has suspended operation on the first GPM-and so we have to have a better definition.

And we'd say the first GPM is the latest GPM on the track, and the second GPM is the next to the latest on the track, and the third GPM is third from the latest on the track, and I don't know what number the GPM is back at the year 200 trillion. On some pcs it will probably be number 52; and on some pcs it'll be number 31, don't you see? So to get a consistent numbering, when we say the first GPM, we mean the one which is nearest or the latest formed-let us say, that way-it's the latest-formed one.

It's the goal of that one that you have to have, but some pcs have skidded their wheels. They've listened to speeches by the Democrats or they've

they've looked over Australian legal procedure or something like that, and they've skidded their wheels. And they've gone back to the second GPM and are living this life in the second GPM. You understand that?

They've met an oppterm, let us say, in the second GPM of sufficient magnitude to cause *them* to be the terminal of the second GPM. You understand? That's horrifying, isn't it? Well, I'll tell you why it's horrifying. Because if you found the goal that they are living at this moment, it wouldn't run. That makes some pcs more difficult to find goals on than others. You follow that?

Now, what-what is more complicated is that the first GPM may or may not be fully formed. You may have only the first eight items of the first GPM formed, or you may have only the first sixteen items of the first GPM formed-because of course the pc, normally is forming these things progressively as you move on up the track. Well, as we were saying last night, it is really too bad that we didn't have somebody at various points of the track, and he took a gun and he said-he said with this gun-he said, "Everyone will now postulate his sixty-fifth GPM goal" -*bang!* You see, and we all did it at once. Only it didn't work that way.

Some fellows postulated theirs thousands of years ago, some billions of years ago, and some trillions of years ago. So this of course makes-this of course makes it an uneven number.

Now, the only thing missing, if you look in the May-March 13th bulletin 63, and you look at that line plot, some GPMs aren't formed-let us say, theoretically- they aren't formed any further forward than "a cabaret singer." That's the top item you find in the thing. So it's not very reliable finding it, we'd ask him-we'd find this terminal; we'd say, "Well, what is the goal of a cabaret singer?" or "What is the goal of a hostile audience?" don't you see, and it doesn't answer up well for the goal. Cabaret singer, they'd say, "To sing; to exhibit myself; to experience life; to appear on TV, you see; to be Miss America," -something like that. And pretty soon, why they'd come around on it and they'd-"Ah, well, it-there isn't any goal there." Don't you see?

If it was formed all the way to the top, of course, because you've got the overt-the goal as an overt at the top-against "a mute." What goal would be an overt against a mute? And the pc would tell you almost at once "To scream." And what is the goal of the most screamish? Naturally, "to scream." But halfway down the bank what have we got? *Hooh-hooh*. We've got a cabaret singer versus a hostile audience. That's the pair. Interesting.

What is the goal of a hostile audience? "To hiss, to boo." "Never to scream."

So it's tough to find these things when they're amputated. That's an amputated GPM. You'll find everything below that, however, is-is quite standard. It's just that it's bobtailed.

Now, that's a complication. Now, the pc let us say, who has one of these bobtailed GPMs, easily skids. And let us say that-that next goal below there, by the way, is "to be happy." It was never put in on that March the 13th bulletin-and you get "a miserable sod." That's the-the terminal, you see, "a miserable sod." And the pc is accustomed to being a miserable sod, he was that for quite a while, and he didn't complete the thing "to scream." He'll move on forward there, his next life or something like that.

But just at the present time he's grinding to a slow halt being a miserable sod and "be part of the Kennedy clan in Ireland," you know, something like this. And there he is, a miserable sod. And he's confronted all the time with happy people-happy people. Oh-ho, brother! He can't stand it, you know? Just happy people -rrr-rrr-rrr! Maybe he had an aunt or something who was a happy person, you know, who went around all the time being happy, you know, with exclamation points, you see. You couldn't hear yourself think in the house, you know? She, of course, his-his aunt would just be mad at everybody who wasn't happy, you see.

And so here you've got this oppterm, "happy people," and you've got the terminal, "a miserable sod," and you go listing terminals-and you've done some 2-12 on this character or something, you see-you get this goal "to be happy." Well, it ticks and it clicks, and it-zzzt, goes out. And you spend thirty-six hours prepchecking it, and it doesn't shape up.

And finally somebody sees it rocket read a couple of times, and they say, "Well, let's list it. Let's list it." So you start listing the thing with a heavy grind, and you - it finally delivers up - finally delivers up "happy people. " And the rocket read on the goal was about three-eighths of an inch. By the time you get to "happy people," well, it'll be about a quarter of an inch. And you get "a miserable sod," and it's going to be about an eighth of an inch, and then you get your next item; and -and so on, and the pc has got somatics and so forth.

Funny part of it is, it almost runs, but you've just got trouble, trouble, trouble. What'd you do? By accident you have picked up the second GPM. You haven't picked up the first GPM.

By the way, the goals that go out hard-the goals that go out hard-are very often goals of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth GPM, you see.

But you start-you're trying to run this second GPM. Well, my golly, there's all those terminals in the first GPM above it, don't you see? The second GPM with one of these bobtailed first GPMs will almost run. But you've got bypassed items. As a matter of fact, you haven't just got bypassed items, you've got a bypassed GPM. And life can look pretty grim to the pc. But the goal is not behaving well.

One of the things that this goal has to do is fire better. If properly handled and not overlited, not overlited-you get too long a source list, and you get all the G-all the items, all the RIs in the bank are on the goal oppose list, you know. You could practically go back down

the thing and find every RR item that gave a dirty read. Drill the thing, you get it to fire nicely, and so forth, it'll b-you could almost disassemble a whole GPM off one of these overlists, you know? And bypassed items like mad. Sometimes there'll be as many as two and three items, additional on one of these item oppose lists which are overlistered. -

The gaiety with which some auditors run through flat spots and get more RRs and all this sort of thing, the way they fool around, of course they get bypassed items. Well, getting a lot of bypassed items will upset a pc, but nothing will upset a pc more than missing a whole GPM.

Well, this makes the finding of goals difficult on some pcs. The average pc that you run into -he'll be in his first GPM and you list the goals one way or another, and you find his goal, bang-and it rocket reads a little bit occasionally, and then you list it and it gets rocket reading items and it's all better. And how you go on down the bank and the rocket read now is a half inch and the rocket read is an inch and a quarter, and the rocket read is two inches. See, the more items you find, the more it rocket reads. And then the goal starts to fire with an R/S and an RR alternately. You know, you call it, *bang-bang-bang*, and "to scream," RR; "to scream," R/S; "to scream," RR. And next thing you know, why this thing is firing early and late. It's "to scream"-pssww! And "to ."-PSsww! It doesn't fire on time. It's in a messed-up bank.

See, I mean the bank is unable to support that charge any more, and then the goal goes to a tick and you keep running it and you get on out the bottom of the bank and you're away. That's the way a goal should behave as it goes on down the line. It's all given in that March 13th bulletin.

But some pc, you get ahold of him, you get this goal, you see, "to be happy." It rocket reads. You prepcheck it, it rocket reads, it's okay. It does all right. It checks out. Pc is kind of unhappy about it, but it checks out. And you get the first item and you get the second item and you get the third item, and by that time the goal read is almost microscopic. And you get the fourth item, you get the fifth item, you get the sixth item-you can't detect anything on the list. Everything is disappearing. Pc's RR is going off, and so forth. It's a mess.

And so you slug away; you've got headaches, you know. Eventually you get smart and decide that you're going to find another goal, and you do, and you find something that practically explodes in your face, see. And it just runs like mad. And you find a few items, they all rocket read and it all comes off and the goal does a blowdown and so forth; you've gotten rid of your first GPM.

But that a pc can be dramatizing a terminal or oppterm of the second GPM, and actually have a first GPM where the goal is to be found, adds randomness. What kind of randomness? It means you try to prepcheck his present time, and you're prepchecking the second GPM. I think-think that's quite fascinating, don't you? All of present time is connected with the second GPM. At least that appears to me to be the way some of these banks may lie.

So you try to do a Prepcheck, you try to do a Problems Intensive, you try to do auditing on this character-and he's always ARC broke. Why? Because you're in the middle of the second GPM. That's life. Life to him is the second GPM. Well, he was busy forming the first GPM and he was going on all right, but because the second one is so handy he dropped back into the second one's goal. He said-his mama, for instance, told him he had to be good, and so forth, and the second GPM's goal is "to be good." In other words, he gets dropped back.

Well, you try to do a Problems Intensive on this person, from a date, you'll get away with it as long as it's problems. But the second it becomes purposes, you're in trouble. You're in bad trouble. Because you say, "Since 1950 how has a purpose been suppressed?" And it darn near tears the pc's head off. Why? Because since 1950 they've been living in the purpose of the second GPM and that is an intolerable area. It's just as though he were trying to run the first GPM while the p- or trying to run the pc through the third GPM, you see, while you had the second GPM intact. Oh man, it-it's just *blahh!*

So what's this mean? Well, in the first place-in the first place, it means that goals finding is very difficult on some pcs. And this isn't any majority of pcs. And it means that a pc you're having trouble-an awful lot of trouble-finding the goal on by standard methods, has got the-a couple of GPMs mixed up and you're having trouble with him that way. It also means that you have to be terribly permissive the way you run any kind of an intensive. And a goals intensive would have to be run without regard to a time span.

So we get what is designated right now as 2GX1. And that is a Goals Intensive by Prepcheck. And that is very, very, very, very permissive.

Now, eventually a bunch of reworked buttons will be put out, but the-you can use those eighteen buttons. You have to have "blunted," "thwarted," "perverted" in there as buttons when you're handling purposes.

The way you do this is you just sit the pc down in a chair whether he's connected to the E-Meter or not, and you give him a Purpose Intensive there. That's the Goals Intensive by Prepcheck-2GX1.

How do you do it? Now listen to me. Now listen to me. The commands of this are very dangerous-and they mustn't be changed around. You change them around and you're going to wind that pc around a-the nearest telegraph pole. If you were to say, "What purpose have you suppressed?" you're going to run up stacks and stacks and stacks of missed withholds because he won't tell you how he suppressed it. And that'll all amount to missed withholds and your pc practically goes rigid, turns into board, and he'll eventually not even be able to talk. Why? Because you're running five, six, eight, twelve missed withholds every command that you give him.

So it's very important to follow this command. It's very tricky the way it's been

worked out. You've got to get the overt against the purpose, but it is not necessary to get the purpose. You understand? You're not interested in what the purpose in the answer is-you are interested in the overt. You have to stay interested in the overt. Otherwise -otherwise, the pc is going to have the overt from you as a missed withhold. That's one important fact. And the next important fact I've already given you, is it mustn't be run against a time span. There must be no present-time time span. Why? Pc might be in the second GPM. You don't know.

So, give him a very, very permissive type. That doesn't mean that he doesn't have to answer the questions. But give him a very permissive type of command. See, the wording of the thing's got to be very permissive. It's got to get the overt. It doesn't have to get the purpose.

All right. The command, then, is precisely this command: It's not "since" anything, it is simply "How has a purpose been (mid rud button)" by permissive Repetitive Prepcheck. Keep driving him on. This thing is going to take a long time. You get the idea? You're not going to clean up this first button on Suppress-well, under three hours, or something like that. It's going to take time.

And you're actually looking at about a twenty-five-hour intensive. And you just take all of those mid rud buttons, which of course in 2GX1 will be shifted around to fit the idea of purpose. Most of the old ones are left in, and these new goals things are added. And you just run this as a Prepcheck. It's just, "How has a purpose been suppressed?" see, and then, "How has a purpose been invalidated?" And, "How have you been careful of a purpose?" See, it all must be "How-how," not ever "What"-never. Never, never, never, never, "What"-it's catastrophic.

Now, supervised- supervised to the degree that they flatten these questions, and that the auditor stays pretty muzzled, and that that auditing command never, never, never varies over to a "What"- "What purpose" you see-but must stay on "How has a purpose ?" You've got just about the finest co-audit process you ever wanted to look at. And that is a natural for co-audits. Pc finally runs down and doesn't have any more, and so forth-well, let him go on to the next button. You see, it can be run actually meterless, if you're running that kind of a co-audit.

Now, that's going to show you up some-some interesting views. In actual fact, the person whose goal is in an area he has now retreated from, temporarily, will actually be able to find enough in present time that is an harmonic on the first GPM to be able to run it. But if you force it with the present time or an "In this lifetime" or "Since 1950," or anything of that character-if you enforce this, and force him to answer that auditing command as though it is with an ax-this lifetime-You're making him run the wrong goal. Interesting, isn't it? On some cases you'll actually run the wrong goal.

It's taken quite a bit of threading around and that sort of thing to-to get these data, and

they're quite valuable.

But then on the surface of it, Routine 2GX1 is just about the simplest idiot's delight that you ever had anything to do with. That's just that-there it is. It is just, "How has a purpose been suppressed?" "How has a purpose been suppressed?" "How has a purpose been suppressed?" "How has a purpose been suppressed?" "How has a purpose been suppressed?" for about three hours, you see. And then "How has a purpose been invalidated?" "How has a purpose been invalidated?" "How has a purpose been invalidated?" you see, and on and on and on.

And you'll find the pc cycles, and you want to cycle him back up to present time; you use the cyclic rules in this thing, you know. I mean a lot of the old auditing rules come in. But actually you can't go very wrong with the thing, providing you don't say, "In present time." Got it?

Well, that's 2GX1. That's conditional numbering too, by the way. But probably hold true. Now, you say, well what happens to the Problems Intensive? Well, we've had a Problems Intensive for quite a while and hasn't had a number, and it is not vital that you run a Problems Intensive to find the goal. You'll find Problems Intensives on a great many people will locate the goal, but on some people, because you're using present time, you're not going to find the goal, and it's not going to unburden. It'll do them a lot of good, but it's not going to find any goal.

So therefore, the old twenty-five-hour Problems Intensive does not belong in the 2G series. What's the G stand for? "Goals," of course.

All right. Now, that sets the case up, loosens them up so they can get an idea of goals. And that basically is the most elementary process I know to set a case up to find goals. Now, that's still got an X on it, and that'll be taken off in due course, or the process will be shifted or adjusted to account for any other variables. But as far as I can see at this present moment, early tests-not on that process but on all the processes that didn't work- demonstrate that that's about the only one that will.

Now, our next-our next item here on these is what for years has simply been listing and finding goals. You've all been doing that. You know all about it. But that becomes 2G2. There doesn't have to be any X connected with it because we know it of old. Well, what does it consist of? You write a list of goals - you take a list of goals off the pc - and you null the list, and you put in the big mid ruds on the goals which remain ticking on the list. That's the most elementary form of it. There is a more elementary form, but it very often misses the goal. So we're not going to say that it is the most elementary form. It isn't the most elementary form.

It's simply the oldest. And that is to say we write a list of goals-the oldest form was we took a short list of goals, read them over, found out which one dived the most on the meter

and called that the pc's goal. It's not very accurate.

The next one is we made a long list of goals and we eliminated, and that one-with no Tiger Drill; we didn't have it then-and that one which still ticked we called the pc's goal. That was very susceptible to wrong goals. An awful lot of right goals were found that way, but some wrong ones were found that way, too.

Now, that old elementary system-that old elementary system is not the best goals system. Nor is it the most elementary or fundamental. The most fundamental system on finding goals is simply to list some goals on the pc-null those goals by elimination, calling each goal three times in case the pc's attention is wandering; take those that still tick-because you see, the odd part of it is, is even though the goal has been invalidated and that sort of thing the invalidations add up to a read by elimination; and do the whole lot, get two, three, four, five, something like this, that have a DR on them or a tick left on them that didn't go out by elimination; and just put in the big mid ruds on each one of those.

There's a shorter method than that, which is just to put in the left-hand buttons on each one, which is Suppress, Careful of, and Fail to reveal. But on an operation of this character you'd better put in the big mid ruds, because you may have a pc who's protesting or deciding or that sort of thing, and it's safest to put in the big mid ruds.

So that is, in actual fact, the most elementary goals finding method. Now, when we list the goals if we list them on a meter, we don't change the process. It is simply that we can mark in an RR if we see it or an R/S if we see it. And that helps the auditor because he's not going to take a goal that he saw an RR on and give it a light dust-off, don't you see? So that is simply a security. You need a meter, but the listing on the meter is not absolutely essential to 2G2. Not absolutely essential, but a neat 2G2 would list it on the meter, and you would see whether or not these goals RRed or R/Sed as you wrote the things down. You got that? And when it's being done by an auditor, that-that would be-that would be fine.

In actual fact, the reason why we say it isn't absolutely essential that we do that is you're going to find a co-audit practice occasionally will be to list somebody's goals, and even though we give the person a meter to list them on, the designations which they give are not necessarily accurate. And therefore it doesn't matter what these things are designated, you still do the same things. See, whether it's listed on the meter or not listed on the meter, you do the same action. Just listing it on the meter helps you out. And that action consists of first, to list the goals from the pc. Some pcs have goals lists they've already done and that sort of thing, well, that can be included, but shouldn't at this stage of the game be encouraged. That's not 2G2.

And you take some goals; you list them, then when you've got this list in a section or a full list or with tone arm action or without tone arm action -we don't care anything about the tone arm action-we don't care how many goals we list, we don't care if we list a hundred goals,

we don't care if we list a thousand goals; we don't care anything about that at all. But the suggestion is to keep it down-keep it down to a couple of pages. Just keep it down to a couple of pages. In other words, we do a couple of pages of goals, we null those two pages of goals, we put in the big mid ruds on those that still RRed or ticked. And then we take another couple of pages of goals, and then we null that couple of pages of goals and so forth, and put in the big mid ruds.

In other words, this is based on a finding. Over the years we have found that, as one of you is doing to a pc at the present time, about the cruelest thing you could do to the pc is to list goals and never null them. That's a very cruel thing. And if you've got a long cumbersome list, the auditor's tendency is not to null it because it is just too long and hard.

Now, in view of the fact that in most pcs the goal occurs in the first 150 goals listed, you can see there that-that's a fact; they're the first 150 listed. That if you list those things in little sections-you know, just a couple of pages, front and back of the page, you know, that sort of thing, and then null them, and so on-you're never going to get into a big high-tension situation with the pc. Pcs get very anxious. They put their goal on the list and you're nulling this 500 goals list, don't you see. You say, what happened to the 850 goals list? Well, what happened to yesterday, see? We're talking now about 2G2. And it has nothing to do with what we were doing. -

So you list this list; you null this list; you put in the big mid ruds on what you've got left. You *watch-bang*, you'll eventually see some fireworks on the thing. Well, most of your goals are going to be found that way. Just as elementary as that. Just no more-no more upset than that.

When you've got 2G2 up to a thousand goals and you haven't got the pc's goal, let me tell you something: That pc is in the second or third GPM in present time and present time has nothing to do with the first GPM. You see this? So this pc is dislocated as far as the bank is concerned, and the goal isn't readily available. This is your first conclusion.

Now, what do you do? Well, you could keep this up -I don't really see any reason to keep it up beyond about a thousand goals because I've seen those pcs who have gone above a thousand goals still haven't put their goal on the list. I haven't seen them put their goal on the list till-up to about three thousand goals. Five thous-I know one pc who had about five thousand goals and didn't get his goal on the list. I finally had to dig it up out of a -so on, by other means.

But there-there's a limit then to 2G2. If you easily find the pc's goal by this method why do anything else? If you don't easily find the pc's goal by this method, and the auditor actually knew when the meter read and when it didn't and actually could null a list somewhat, there isn't really any point in continuing 2G2. Frankly, to continue it beyond five hundred, you start wasting time.

But let's put it on as an absolute limit of a thousand. And let's put it on, if you're going to do 2G2, at an absolute minimum -absolute, just minimum, minimum of two hundred. Because the average is that, well, it's some percentage of pcs-I don't know, some guess-half the pcs you run into have their first goal in the first 150 goals they give you. And that actually is the totality of this action. That's the totality of it.

Now, administration enters in here. You're going to turn goals-finding loose, for God's sakes preserve the lists. Impress people with the necessity of writing down the full goal, as given by the pre-C. I ran into some old South African ACC goals lists. Goals lists? That was pretty good. I mean, it was the first ones taken down there. This is what taught me. They took a piece of paper, see-they took this piece of paper-and they-let's take a goal, "to be a railroad foreman," see, and it says, "RR 4." And that's written this way, see. And then over here it's "to be a *kchunh!*" And then over here, it's "like run like anything." And over here someplace is "queen." To be a queen? To shoot a queen? What? See?

No, get them to take the full goals down in an orderly column, with the pc's name and the date of the list on the top, and null it with the standard method of nulling. X's and slants in other words-R/S, RR, and so forth. And preserve that list. It's valuable.

That's the main danger in goals finding is not that some student auditor or HPA or somebody like that is going to goof and not find the fellow's goal. We don't-couldn't care less. So he goes over the top of the fellow's goal. The trouble-the trouble that comes up ...

We've had-we've had goals list after goals list that somebody's gone back and nulled the goals list and they found the goal in the first seventy-five goals. You know, somebody had just ridden right over the top of it, reading like mad.

No, the trouble comes when they take that piece of paper and don't put it in a folder, and when they wrote it down in the first place didn't write the full goal down and didn't date it and didn't put the pc's name on it, and didn't put it in the folder. And when they didn't do that they put the pc in trouble. That's what made the trouble.

The only way you can get a pc in trouble, then, with 2G2 -the only way you can get him into trouble -is to fail to write down the full goal as given by the pc, put the pc's name and date on the thing, and to put it in a folder, and then keep the folder and don't lose it. That's the main-the main thing that has to be taught on that along with everything else you teach. Don't fool with that, because a pc is actually put in danger by this.

The odd part of it is, is sometimes it's such a failure to them not to have their goals found that they-they never put it on a list again. For instance, I've looked over I don't know how many thousands of goals; and you know, I never put my first goal down on a list the second time. It wasn't until the auditor was one day nulling or listing-listing some goals, and listed another goal, and I'd spotted a spot where I'd thought of the first goal, and all of a sudden gave the first goal, and I think the thing read a dial-wide rocket read. I-I said, "That's

-that's -that's my goal, you know. That's-that. .. Wait! Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa! That's my goal, see?" It had already been checked out and hadn't fired, about-I don't know, three, four, five times. Been on a-it had been on a list for over a year. It's within I think the first 130 goals or something like that. It's one of the very, very early goals. I've forgotten what number it is; maybe it's number 98 or something like that.

Now, all during that year I'd-just had never put it on another list. I put everything else on lists, but not that one. So those early lists are quite important, and they must be kept, and you must impress on anybody who does this that the list must be accurate, must be dated, must have the pc's name on it, and must be kept and made available to future auditors. That pc must know that that is a valuable piece of paper. He won't think it is, but he's got to have it that way. He's got to realize that it is available and the auditor must, must realize that it is very valuable. That's 2G2.

All right. Now, 2G3 consists of taking any and all items that have ever been found on the pc-I just described it to you in the last lecture I gave you - any and all items ever found on a pc by any means or any method of any kind, and you list goals on them, "What might be the goal of a "-just as though they were all oppters. You know, the oppters-the early oppters have the pc's goal. And then, if you don't find it then, why then you list every item of any kind ever found on the pc, and anybody used it for anything whatsoever, you list it with "What goal would be an overt against it?" and "What goal would be an overt against a T9 you know. And you-you list every item that way. Why? You list terms and oppters.

In other words, 2G3 does not differentiate between a term and oppterm. It only differentiates between two actions: Listing any item ever found on the pc-"What goal might be the goal of" or "What might be the goal of a" whatever the item is. And then if the goal is not found in that way, then we treat the whole thing as an oppterm, the way we used to treat oppters. That is, "What goal would be an overt against" every item on the list. Actually, that's best used for terminals. As you look at that March 13th line plot you'll find out why.

So anyway, this operation is a very easy operation. And once more, about the only crime you can commit with it is not to null the pc's goals once listed. So you actually don't write down the goals of fifteen items, and then null them all. You don't do that-you don't do that. You-you write down the "What might the goal of a catfish be?" You write and list until the question is clean, and usually that is never more than fifty-sixty goals, something like that-at the absolute outside. Then you take that fifty or sixty goals as a unit and you don't go on to something else now-you take that one and you null it, and you put the big mid ruds against the ones that are still left. And you're going to get some commotion there and that will be it.

All right. You go on and on and on that way. And eventually if you don't find the pc's goals using all these things ever found and so forth-if you don't find the pc's goal, by saying "What might the goal be?" you see-you say, "What goal would be an overt against T' and you

list them all that way. And you eventually pick up the person's goal. But take one item at a time, and list it as though that's all you're ever going to do, and finish up that cycle of action and so forth.

It's a very cruel thing to list goals on a pc and then not null them. This is a very bad thing. I know, because my pc has done a lot of long lists, wrote in her own time and so forth, and I've never nulled these things. She, I mean, every once in a while is bringing these things up, and that sort of thing.

Now, you do that piece by piece, then. It's all little piecework. And any moment you're liable to turn up-well, you list from the earliest item forward. Earliest item. Why? Well, it's much more likely to have been the top item-the top oppterm of the GPM if it was found on the pc a long time ago.

So 2G3 takes care of old-time people who have had a lot of things found on them, so therefore is a somewhat specialized process. Well, where does that put us with raw meat that has no items of any kind whatsoever? Well, it puts us into 2G4. And 2G4 is the new name of Routine 2-12. Only it's a different process than Routine 2-12, because it does not require that you find any item on it and oppose it. Now, it's merely the first stages of 2-12, but actually it's also 3GA Criss Cross.

Now, I don't mean to leave you in a confusion, because it's one of these-one of these elementary actions- elementary action indeed. You make a list, use the 3GA titles. For the same reasons I gave you earlier in the lecture, you do not use present time or present lifetime or any such questions, because you're dealing with goals and the pc might be elsewhere than in the first GPM.

So here we have a situation where we make a list. Well, those are the old 3GA Lists. There's no particular reason I should give you a whole bunch of lists on this. But I'll give you an idea of the type of list these things are. "Who does everybody more or less dislike?" "Who or what does everybody more or less dislike?" And you'll find the pc will give you the top oppterm. You see, it's simple, huh?

Well, you lo -you run a list, and you hope that the auditor will see it RR or R/S or do something active, and find out that that is the item. But in actual fact, in actual fact-I correct something here. I said it's the-it's-it's not the full of 2-12 in this 2G4-it's only the vague shadowings because there's more of it as you go up in higher numbers. This one-this one is very simple-very simple. You have the guy, "Who or what does most everybody dislike?" or "detest?" or something of this sort, and you hope he sees some of these things R/S. And he gives you a long list of these things, and you hope that the R/S is more or less accurate. So we get in agreement with the pc. We don't depend upon the auditor's meter read, see. We don't depend on his nulling the list, we don't depend on him finding items. We have him get in cahoots with the pc and have the pc agree that certain one of these things certainly are-do

match up to the situation. In other words, we let the pc examine the list. They go over it together.

And he'll usually pick the rock slamming items, but that's beside the point. Do you know how many items we can pick off that list? Well, we can use five, we can use six items off that one list. Then, of course, we had our old headings "Who or what have you detested?" and "Who would you rather not associate with?" and also "Who do people not associate with?" you see, "Who or what do people not associate with?" You've got various types of 3GA headings. But none of these are present life, see. You don't say, "In this lifetime," or "In present time" or anything like that, because you might run into this scrambled GPM phenomena.

And how do you use those? How do you use those? I know it horrifies you. You say you take five items off this list and list goals against each one of the five items. Yes. You don't find the item for the list. You got the idea? That's left to 2G5.

Now, if somebody's really sailing, he notices there's some R/Ses on this thing, he can make a four-way package if he hasn't found the goal yet. He can actually find the item on this, oppose it, oppose it, and oppose it-and get a four-way package, and you have 2-12 in full. Total use of 2-12. That's what it's relegated to.

Now, because its numbers have been popularized so, we'll keep on calling it that. We'll keep on calling it 2-12, but remember that in goals finding, and when it is used for goals finding, it is totally dedicated just to finding some items on which you can list goals.

And you see now, that's a built-up series of added complications. You see that? The actual action of listing some goals and then nulling the goals and putting in the big mid ruds, you see-that was 2G2. The actual action of taking a hatful of items and listing goals against those, and doing 2G2 on them, see? And then the actual action of getting a list and picking some things off of this list to list goals against, you see, is actually 2, 3 and 4. And now taking that and building a four-way package with it is 2G5. You got it? So actually it's the same item with the added complication of an additional number, the added complication of additional number, the added complication of additional number, and of course you get the tougher and tougher case. You see that?

So if you don't find the goal by this method, then you find the goal by the next method. And if you don't find the goal by the next method you find the next method. Well, how low down does this start? It starts with 2G1. And you'll find out a certain number of pcs after you have given them 2G1, all of a sudden look at YOU fixedly, their eyes widen, and they say, "My goal is

So that, of course, is the simplest method of goals finding. You didn't-you didn't do anything. And there it rocket reads and everything, and it-and you're all set. So that's-of course that is the most fundamental method of goals finding.

Of course, 2G1 can be so simple that you say, "How has a purpose been suppressed?" "Well, with you sitting there not listening to me when I tell YOU that my goal is 'to catch catfish,'" it rocket reads, and you've got the pc's goal.

I can see some auditor-he's all set here for the next hundred hours, he's studied, you see, he's got this all taped, beautiful shape, and he says, "All right. Now we're going to start this intensive. Now, how has a goal been suppressed?"

"By your refusing to listen to me that my goal is 'to catch catfish'"-

PSSWW!

And "To what?"

Terrible, isn't it? But also, look at the plight of the other fellow who has gone up-clear up to 2G5, and he still doesn't have the pc's goal, and he is getting old and bowed, and it looks like it's a professional activity.

Well, by that time-by that time, let us hope, and let him hope, that I have by that time invented 2G6. That's the only answer I can give you! Anyway, you see, those are the old goals finding methods all brought forward-all brought forward from the simplest to the late.

Now, all of these have worked. And there are certain sins that accumulate to each one, and that is failure to administer, and the other is failure to null what you've listed. That's always cruel.

Now, this can be taught and this can be done. And as a matter of fact you're looking at a preview of the schedule you will be on next week, because we intend, now, by our plot-out and so forth, to find the goal of the person in the X Unit. And not let them out of the X Unit until he does have his goal, and to bung him over into the Y Unit at the earliest, after his goal has been found.

So this is-becomes very important. You're going to get a rearrangement of-of schedule based against the reality of exactly what you're doing. It doesn't change or discredit any of your checksheets, and it doesn't cost you any lost ground. The-"In these lectures, is there anything you have been anxious about?"

Anyway-anyway, all-all-all good fun aside, there-there are the 2Gs, and we'll be doing those things in the X Unit. And in the Y Unit you'll be studying your-your 3M and getting ready to run it. You should realize that it is one thing to find the goal, it is quite something else to run one. And running a goal has become a hazardous profession. It's not-it's not that it is difficult to do; it's that auditors list so enthusiastically, they slide over the top of RIs and they bypass items on their lists, and they do various things like this; and it makes it more complicated than it should be. It is really very mechanical. It is the auditor making it complicated that is giving us trouble at the present time, and we can get around that, too.

But the point-the point is here that we mean to find the person's goal in the X Unit, and run it in the Z Unit. And it immediately and directly breaks down the course into Routine 2 and Routine 3, doesn't it? Well, you say, "Well, what happened to V Unit?" Oh, well-well-well, that's expiring. That's expiring as of Monday morning. It will be a thing of the past because too many people have been relaxing I am told, and flunking themselves down to the V Unit so they get some auditing. The V Unit ran itself up an enviable record of finding goals, and so forth-and that's supposed to be done in the X Unit now, so there we are.

A student first coming in, is not going to be given even a grace period now, he's just going to go straight onto rudiments and Havingness. As soon as he's got his rudiments and Havingness -that's rudiments, Havingness and Sec Checking. Soon as he's got this down so he looks good, he moves straight and directly up to the X Unit-we start working with his goals, he finishes up his checksheet. As soon as he's got his goal and his checksheets are finished, he goes into the Y Unit, he studies in the Y Unit-nothing but study in the Y Unit-gets all ready to go into the Z Unit and run goals.

That's the way I'm streamlining the situation. And it'll work out a lot better for you.

We're going for blood on this. We want goals, we want Clears, and there's no time to goof around on it. So I'm arranging the schedule just to that degree to make sure that it moves on forward.

Now, you see, you don't think you ever cause anything, you see, and I've had my ear to the grindstone-I think it was my ear-and I heard some of you complaining about lack of checkouts or complaining about this and complaining about that, and you complained yourself into a brand-new schedule, so it's all your fault. It's all your fault, and I haven't anything to do with it. But I'm running a goal at the present moment, my fifth-and the goal is "to be responsible," so you will-you-you'll forgive me-you'll forgive me if I'm slightly aberrated on the subject at this particular moment. It's all your fault. Okay?

All right. Well, that's all we have, and I hope you can put this -this Routine 2 information to very good effect, and I hope where you're going that you can teach HPAs and HCAs how to find these things, and you'll notice that they stack right up with each additional step following in behind the next so there's no waste of motion on it. Finding goals has been researched over a period now of two or three years, and I think you'll find it's pretty good.

All right. Well, thank you very much. Thank you very much, and good night.