TOP OF THE GPM

A lecture given on
16 April 1963

How are you, how are you?

Well, this is the what? The 16th of April AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, today I could talk to you about a lot of things. I could talk to you about quite a few things. Talk to you about goals. Talk to you about GPMs. Talk to you about the basics of auditing. But I'd rather talk to you at the moment on the subject of the GPM. 1, frankly, have been somewhat holding you back from getting too enthusiastic going down the bank because you omit the tops of some of these goals and the results can be quite catastrophic. And believe it or not I didn't know what the top of a goal was exactly like, even after doing a dozen GPMs-I still couldn't guarantee what the pattern of the top of a GPM was.

Now, I finally managed to get this squared up.

Now, I've been restraining some of your enthusiasm for going down into a bank, and knocking a bank together out of any old thing and then going on and finding the next goal and then going on and finding the next goal and then going on and finding the next goal and running part of that bank and then going on and finding the next one.

This perhaps is forgivable from the standpoint of research. I myself have had to do it. That's no particular reason you should or your pc should.

Now, some of the banks that we get in here, and we've seen some actual banks of one kind or another, some of these banks are the most incredible hotchpotchs, and potpourris which I think you have ever seen. They are absolutely incredible. In the whole bank there are nothing but a few locks and numerous pieces of other GPMs. This is quite interesting.

We just had one in here from California that was enough to fry your hair.

Now, this applies very much to goals finding. And you know, I wouldn't-I just wouldn't let a pc have the goal "to create," the goal "to do," "to be," "to have," "to be cause," "to cause," any such goal. I just wouldn't let the pc have it. It appeared on the list, I wouldn't touch it. I'd just go right over the top of it and go somewhere else. That sounds strange, doesn't it?

Well, let me tell you, after I'd had ten banks very thoroughly run, a lot of items still in them and so forth, the goal "to create" got onto a list, and the auditor started to drill the goal

"to create" and the whole bank started to beef up. And listen, I'd had ten banks run-ten-and the goal "to create" appears somewhere at about bank fifteen.

Well, in other words, with that many banks run I still couldn't even stand to have the goal "to create" be drilled, you know; to be tiger drilled. Why?

Well, in actual fact these goals are quite ancient, and the earlier you get on the track, the more force and velocity there is in the energy and enthusiasm with which a thetan mocked these things up, and you get a recurrence of that when you go back too early on the track.

Well, let me tell you something: The goal "to create" is two hundred and sixteen trillion. That's the beginnings of it. And that goal is a multitrillion year goal. And you're going to take some pc that can't even sit still in an auditing chair and you're going to find this goal on him and you're going to run it. Ha-ha. I think- I don't know where the goal "to be" is, but I think it's before that.

Now, naturally the wickedest goal in the bank is the goal "to create." But you are going to take the goal "to be," the goal "to create," the goal "to cause," the goal "to be cause," and you are going to run this on somebody that-ha-ha-ha. No you're not. You're not going to make it. Why not? It's too early, too early. You could probably steer him through it one way or the other and you might even come out the other end with a live pc; might be, if you were lucky and it's all straightened up.

But you get goals in here of one kind or another and-I'm just giving that business about the big goals on the pc's list. The pc's just being enthusiastic and ambitious. His goal is probably "not to breathe in mouse's nostrils," and you're going to run on him the goal "to create." Ha-ha, that's silly, you see. I mean, it's -beyond the reality of the pc. Don't you see?

Now, a goal tends to present itself by it's context. Most of the goals found as the first goal found are designed to be found.

Let's take one. The goal "to know," of course, presents itself like that. Why? Because you want to know somebody's goal so he says "All right, it's the goal 'to know,'" you get the idea. It's a pretty early goal. Not unrunnable, but pretty early.

Let's take another example. Let's take the goal "not to be detected." Well, you say, "How does this present itself?" Well, because it's got someone who wants to be detected, or something like that, in its top oppterms which the pc is dramatizing. So they give you this goal "not to be detected,". because the pc wants to be detected.

The goal "to find," of course, is a natural. The goal "to know the truth" is another natural. These goals-do you understand what I'm saying to you-they tend to present themselves because of their significance.

Now, goals behave in significant ways, but the running of a goal has to do with significance only to the degree of getting the right items, not whether a pc cognites or not. We

don't care whether he cognites. All we want to see is that meter rocket reading. And that's all we want to see. And the amount of recovery the pc will make is simply the number of banks and the amount of charge which we remove from the case.

The pc's confront goes up in direct ratio to the amount of charge removed from the case. And his confront does not go up-does not, definitely not go up-on the amount of confronting he does of the bank.

This is a-this is a peculiarity about the GPM. In other words, you couldn't familiarize somebody with the bank-it's entirely a proposition of charge. Well, this becomes (quote) "quite important" to us. It tells us that the pc is going to be as able as we find GPMs and run them out; not as able as they are significant. Do you understand that?

We have two pcs. One is to have a goal "to be good," the other has a goal "to be a bad man." Well, all right, we run those out. We get an equal recovery as far as the actual status of the case and the ability of the case is concerned; which is comparable. In other words one GPM equals one-so many ergs of recovery. Don't you see?

Now the fact that one has a different experiential track than the other has nothing really to do with auditing. This fellow has an experiential track which has-never has anything to do with business. All down the track he has nothing to do with business. Well, of course, he's going to wind up with an experiential track which to some degree omits business, but at the same time has experience with business because it's a direct opposite. You spend half your time in a GPM doing the opposite to the goal. So the significance of the goal is not of very great importance.

Now, the significance of the goal, however, means something to the auditor. It means that a goal which is so worded is more likely to present itself than a goal that isn't so worded.

All right, let me give you an example. If a pc had the goal "to present this goal to the auditor," that is the goal which the pc would give to the auditor and the auditor would find on the pc. Well, in lesser degree this is true all the way down the line. So that mediocre goals, or quasi-quasi goals, are rather difficult to find because they don't dramatize their own presentation. Do you understand that? To that degree significance is important.

Now, significance is also important in wording up the GPM. That's very significant because the right items in a GPM are worded a certain way and wrong items aren't.

Now you get a GPM and somebody has allegedly had found on him, "to create." This is his first goal, see. Oh, ah, anybody see it read? I doubt it. If anybody saw it read, it read for a moment and the pc quietly expired, but they went ahead and found some items. Well now, they found the item "steam locomotive," "a lady," "astronomy," "pigsties," and one we saw this morning had the marvelous thing of-the goal "to create" I think had in it, or some such goal-the goal had in it the name of the auditor. I know we had it-the auditor had the same name

two hundred and sixteen trillion years ago. See, it's ridiculous.

In other words he didn't find any part of the goal "to create." They found the goal "to create," but didn't find any part of the goal "to create."

Now do you see what happens when you go too far backtrack with one of these goals? Well, it isn't enough to abandon some pc's goal that is rocket reading, just to say, "Well, that's too far backtrack." No, the thing to do is to have confidence that you can plow the pc through anything, providing it rocket reads. But plowing him through that much backtrack, well it just wouldn't happen, it just wouldn't happen, you'd never get him into it. You'd find a whole lot of lock items of one kind or another unless you piloted him very directly.

Now, I am not saying that you should abandon the pc's goal that is rocket reading because it is too early track. But I'm saying that the pc's goal, run, is going to give you a great deal of difficulty. Most of these whole statement goals which are brave and upstanding like "to confront," you know. That's a great goal. That's a nice goal. That's way back on the track, and the goal you are looking for in actual fact is a lot more modern. A pc isn't as full of vinegar in modern time. He's got reservations as to how much power he has. He'll have a goal something like "to get along all right," or "to get along," or a goal "to get out," or a goal "to quit," or a goal "not to quit unless I have to," you understand? Or a goal like "to make it somehow," "to not be sad." Ooh, you know, I mean these are interesting goals or there may be some minor goals the PC knows he can do, which is "to reforest Earth," or something. Or, no, that's pretty ...

The goal that I'm talking about is-the later it is on the track the more significance it is going to have.

That doesn't naturally hold true, because the escape goals, the not confront goals-not the goal "to be free," that's probably pretty early-but the escape goal like "to never go to school," see, something like that. Such a goal as that is more likely to be in present time, and such a goal as "to confront," "to do," "to be," "to have," "to create," "to cause," "to be cause," goals of that character are very early track.

In other words the whole simple thought is backtrack, and the more complicated, nonconfront forms are present time-ish. You got the idea? Present time could contain a goal such as "to be a man," you see? All right, that's a finite goal. On this PC the goal presents itself "to cause," and the auditor drills this goal "to cause," and can never get the thing to go out. It won't go out and it won't rocket read, and it won't do this and it won't do that. Well it can't be run, don't you see. But "to be a man," that can be run. That is runnable, and because it is runnable the individual is able to get through it.

All right, so much for that. Now the later a goal is on the track, the more the PC was likely to dramatize it. And the most important goal to the PC is the one which includes present time. And the top of that goal may not be there fully because it may not be fully

developed. He may not have lived all the way through that goal yet, but nevertheless what top that goal has will be the hidden standard; will be the chronic present time problems of the PC. You see that?

That's as far as the whole track is concerned. In other words, the PC is much more likely to dramatize a recent goal than an ancient goal. You got that? All right. Now that looks at the whole GPMs. See? All of them.

Now, the later an item is in a GPM, the later an item is in a GPM, the more likely it is to be dramatized and the less reality the PC has on it. And that is also true of the whole track. The PC has less reality on a modern goal than an early goal. A PC has less reality on the top of a GPM than its middle.

Now you ask-now this has a great deal to do with running-you ask a PC, you say, "Oh, give me an item in your GPM," you see. It's "to decide," you see, it's "to decide," and he gives you "maybe." In other words, it's not "not decide," and it's not "to decide." He'll give you the crossover area.

PCs tend to give you the middle of the GPM, and left to their own devices more likely give you the middle of the track. They dramatize, however, the material latest in the GPM, and the material latest on the track.

Well now, that's-this is all data. This is actually vital data. It isn't the type of data which you think you can get along without because you can't.

Now, Mary Sue did the rather fantastic (I don't know how many auditing hours she put in over Easter), but she did the rather fantastic thing of running a fifty GPM bank in seven and a half hours, which is the average time of an RI every nine minutes, which includes all breaks, arguments, administration, upsets, everything. One every nine minutes. A seven-and-a-half-hour sprint which encompassed the whole of one GPM.

Now, I don't know the GPMs have less in it. They probably-some of them may have less items in it-in them-than this particular GPM. But there were at least fifty items in this GPM, and the reason there were at least fifty items in it is-I know we didn't miss many because missing one was something like being blasted out of the chair. The second you missed an item, why, the whole world sort of went *nyaah,* and the corners of the room went out of plumb, and got sick at my stomach, and so forth. This body did not like it at all.

Any one of these items in this GPM was the equivalent charge to a bank later on the track-than a whole GPM later on the track. This thing is a crusher. I'm speaking from experience. I'm speaking of the goal "to create," and we ran it out last night in a seven-and-a-half-hour sprint. Rather fantastic.

Why did I have to do this? Well, we actually took the goal "to be cause," "to cause," and the goal "to create," to get early enough on the track to get the plot and form of the GPM.

Why? Well the later-the later items are terribly obscured, awfully nailed down, and awfully hard to get at. They do not reveal themselves easily, and we had run all the way back down, I think "to create" is about the fifteenth GPM I've run.

We haven't prepchecked these things. We haven't cleaned up all the items in them, but this one we did clean up well in order to get the pattern of the GPM.

Well, we've been struggling along in that direction, and I've been trying very hard to get it and suddenly it came to view why the top of the GPM is missing. And the top of the GPM is missing for this excellent reason: (I don't know if you can see this or not. The top items of the GPM, the first fourteen items-that is to say, the first twelve items down from the top of a GPM, I said fourteen because I know the next two), but the first twelve items are simply positive-negative.

In other words, we've got one here which is a noun, you see, and that's the noun. And over here we have no noun. Now, if a pc dramatizes-you see this is your-this is your oppterm, and this is your term. Now, if the pc dramatizes the top of the bank more easily than the bottom of the bank, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha

what happened to the top of the GPM? This gets very interesting. What happened to it? Well, no noun overlaid noun. A top oppterm was noun, you see. Let's say it was "to scream," you see. So this is "scream," or "screams." Now this would be "no screams." The top terminal is just "no screams." Simple as that.

Well, with these two collapsed on each other, every time the pc looks at "screams," he says, "No, it's not screams," you see. He says, you see, "Screams, well it's no screams," so there aren't any screams.

Now the next one is a -is the goal with an "-ing" form followed by a no same, see. So that's "screaming," and every time the pc would look at it, this top being collapsed, term and oppterm, the terminal of course is "no screaming." So every time he looks at "screaming," well he sees immediately then that there-it's no, you know, it's-there's no screaming. You see, it's not there. And that's true of the first twelve items of the top of a GPM. Every one of them is cancelled out by the fact that it's a direct negative.

You've got the top five oppterms, and they are all followed by negatives. And they go, the next one here goes "-ers," and it's "no -ers," and the next one is, horribly enough, "-ingness; -ingness," and this is "no -ingness," and then it is "-ishness," and then "no -ishness," and then finally, "-ivity," and I think-of course I haven't compared this to the top rungs as far as the upper goals are concerned-but I think there is a whole constant because this is in das master plan that you chumps laid down. I don't know what the hell is the matter with you people. What did you-what did you do that for? You know, that's silly.

Anyhow, here's this-here's this puzzle. The next one down from that on the oppterm

side is "beings who goal," or "people who goal," depending on what part of the track you are on. You know, if you are on the early track there aren't any people. You might have been back there sometime, you might have noticed there are no people. And of course on this side, why of course it's "a being who never goals," or later on the track, "someone who never goals."

Well anyhow, what's all this positive-negative proposition? Well, it's just a gradient scale of how the goal increases. Now of course, these-I might have these, one or two of these turned around, but what you are looking at here is the, is the first real look at one of these GPM tops. And the idiocy here of course is this negative all on the terminal side. The first-I said five, that's not correct. One, two, three, four, five, six, the first six terminals from the top and the first six oppterms from the top exactly compare except the terminals have "no" in front of them, or "not."

Now you get a beingness form goal like "to be-to be slap happy," and you then get the "-ing," of course is "being slap happy." And this of course is "not being slap happy" over here. I'm talking about the second from the top, the top and then the next one to it. This goal -ing means of course "being slap happy," and the negative version is "not being slap happy."

Now some of you unfortunate people who have cooked up a goal which is "to skate on the Empire State embankment unless the police catch up with me," nevertheless have all these goal forms as far as I can find out, and how you squeeze all that into a single goal form I don't know.

But here's-here's the weird one about this thing. We've got "to be slap happy," you see. Well how do you get it into an "-er" form? What are the "-ers?"

Well, oddly enough the bank wasn't laid in in English. I don't know if that ever occurred to you or not, but you haven't been speaking English very long. And what you are doing is approximating in English just thetan-thought concept which exists without semantics. So much for Hayakawa and Korzybski. Semantics isn't the end-all of everything, it's just what semantic sits on the thought concept, because a thetan can hold this thought concept. And of course these thought concepts are not expressed in English, and you get such a thing as "being slap happers," or some such thing, "being slap happers." And you get "slap happingness," "being slap happingness." And you get "slap happyishness." And you get "slap happyivity." That sounds like gobbledygook, but you're going to be the most amazed person in the world when you find it start rocket reading on your pc. "Oh, ho," he says, "what's this, what's this, what's this?" Well it's because he didn't live the bank in English. He didn't live it in any language, and that you could get it into English at all is fabulous.

Now this "-ishness" is quite interesting. It's different than-well let's take, let's take "create," see. We have "creating, creators, creatingness," that's all perfectly happy. And we also have "creativity." Well this one in here, what's this "-ishness?" Well actually you have "creatishness." It means the tendency, the tendency toward creatingness. And that all matches

up in English to the actual thought concepts that are in it ' which I think is quite amusing.

But anyway there's the top of the GPM, and of course each one of those things has a suitable negative. And "to skate on the Empire State Building so the police won't catch me," oh brother, you've got a job on your hands. How do you make that into a noun? Well it's not "skating upon the top of the Empire State Building so the police won't catch me." It's probably "skated" or it's probably, well, it will be something on the thing that says the nounal form of skate, to skate, you see. And maybe that's a "skut." But whatever it is, you take "to bring all of my money home to my mother." You see? This noun form becomes "brought all my money home to my mother," see. Some such expression, but it is what it is and it will not be "paycheck." You understand? See, it won't be a different word. It'll be "brought all of my money home to my mother," you see. It'll be that sort of thing. It might even be, "brought home money," you see. But whatever it is, it is what it is, and fits under that noun form.

Now, right across from it of course is "not it," you see. "No," "no brought money home to my mother." Something of that sort, and that will express this concept.

Now of course it's very easy "bringing money home to my mother," and "not bringing money home to my mother." "Bringers of money home to my mother," and "no bringers of money home to my mother." "Bringingness of money home to my mother," "no bring-" or "not," (no or not) "bringing home-" "bringingness home to my mother," "bringingness money home to my mother," "bringishness money home to my mother," "not bringishness home -money home to my mother," and "bringivity." And you say, "Oh, that isn't English." You're right, you're right, you didn't lay these banks in in English.

I think it's quite amusing. And of course the joke is on the poor pc who has such a goal as his first goal, and the poor auditor who finds the goal, knowing he had better find the goal, not "to be," or something like this, but find the goal "to be a good, sweet, little fairy who makes children happy."

Ha-ha. Well of course you just keep working on the verb form of it till it fits in. Now it's got to rocket read, and the odd part of it is you'll find it does rocket read.

Now there is a school of thought of "What is Ron doing entering my bank this way?" Well, I'd say you've got an awful-you've got an awful slow reaction if you have that school of thought. But what have I been doing for thirteen years? That's just bum; you just noticed. What do you think of somebody that just noticed he's being processed after thirteen years?

Anyhow, the thing is what it is. It isn't what I say it is. And you'll find out that your pc will stay very comfortable, will feel very good and everything is fine if you run the whole GPM with no nonsense about it, and you get the whole GPM. And the pc will feel very strange indeed if you don't run the whole GPM. And if you can catch a pc with a late goal and run the whole thing, or even if the goal-whatever the goal he gave you, catch the early goal and struggle with it if you have to -and you run the whole thing and you get it beginning with the

top oppterm and go right on through without bypassing a single item, work it right on down to the bottom of the GPM, do your RI oppose list at the bottom of the GPM to get rid of that goal as an RI, do all that, prepcheck it up, you'll check it up-check its items, make sure nothing's ticking, just everything in it, prepcheck it up; you're going to feel marvelous, you're going to feel marvelous.

But if you leave the top there, find a bunch of items that belong to another bank and get the goal discharged somehow and get down to the bottom of it and try to prepcheck this muck that won't prepcheck. So then you go and find the next goal and do the same thing with it, and find the next goal and do the same thing with it, and find the same goal and do the same thing with it, and the next goal and do the same thing with it, you're going to have an awful uncomfortable pc.

Now your pc is going to be uncomfortable enough with a goal entered and a couple of bypassed items in it. How do you think your pc's going to feel with four or five or six or eight unfinished GPMs? Well he's going to feel pretty grim. Therefore it is very, very important for you to know the anatomy of a GPM, because let me let you in on something here. Do you know that nobody listing straight in a GPM, including me, has hit the top. They hit the middle beautifully, but they never hit the top. They never hit the top. They just never put it on the list. That's remarkable when you come to think about it. Well that's because it's too late on the track.

Now the things will fire if you present them to the pc. So you get a thing called "directive listing" which-in which you direct the pc's attention to what you want for what particular spot on the thing.

Now, this goes contrary to what we have done formerly, but it's not evaluative because you're not saying, "your item is," you say, "Give me the noun form of your goal." And the pc doesn't give it to you, he gives something else. Well keep taking down what he gives you. Keep telling him, "No, no, no, the noun form. What is the noun form of roaring?"

And the pc says, "Oh, roar."

"No, that's the verb form. Oh no, it's also the noun form isn't it? Roar. Yeah, well, I'll put that on the list: roar."

Okay, it rocket reads. That's it. You are away. Test the thing and so forth. And you say, "Now give me the negative form of that."

And he says, "negative roars." And you say, "No, no, no, no," and he said, "Well, not roaring."

"No, no, no, no, no, the negative form," you know, "like no roar."

He says, "Well all right, if you want to put it that way, no roar."

You say, "That rocket reads."

He says, "It does! Well, what do you know about that."

You know they protest sometimes for a moment or two. "What are you doing entering my bank? How do you know what I've been doing all this time?" It's about time we found out what he's been doing all this time.

Anyhow, you steer him-steer him into your proper forms for these, and you'll find they will fire promptly and properly in sequence.

Now, in keeping with this, here is very good news. Early on the track where they are hardest to run there are no items in the bank, no items in the bank, none, which do not contain the goal as part of the wording. Got that? There are none.

So if this holds true on up the track and forward into present time, then you won't get any more goals whereby you have "to be a lady," oppterm 49 steam locomotive," terminal "astronomy." See? "To be a lady." Well, it's just "lady," or whatever it is. I don't know what "lady" is in its noun form. You'll have to figure that out some day. It's not gentlewoman.

And there it is, you say the thing sits there and then it goes down the line "imperfect being a lady," "active-active lady being." You get this kind of thing. It's got "be a lady," "be a lady," in one form or another. It's "people who are ladies." It's "someone," it's "someone who would never be a lady." You got the idea? It's "lady," "lady," "being a lady," "be a lady," "ladying," so forth. It's just "being a lady," "imperfect ladies," and so forth, and it doesn't even get down to "tarts." It's just the "hopelessness of being a lady" is a low oppterm, don't you see? It's just a "lady, lady, lady, lady, lady." You get, you get the pc's item and it doesn't have the goal expressed in it one way or the other. If the whole bank follows the basic pattern of the very early, big, beefy banks why then we'd say it appeared in each one.

Now, we can't guarantee this is the truth in all of the later banks because we might get a variation. But I have found this to be the case, that you can pick off lots of locks that will RR and apparently disappear when you actually have left sitting right there the key item.

Let's take-let's take the item of "being a tiger." All right, we've got this item, and it's got a lock on it, and it's "imitating large animals." And you get "imitating large animals," and by George it borrows the rocket read from "being a tiger" and rocket reads and you can oppose it, and then you promptly get lost and you don't know where you are going.

In other words this gives us a very, very set and patterned action on a GPM.

Now there's a little bit better news. There's a little bit more news about this, and it's good news, is the lower oppterms, the very low oppterms repeat the very high terminals. So that you again get no noun, and no nouning, or no goaling, and so forth in two or three items down there along the line.

And the only thing that doesn't really contain the goal expressed in the item on a whole GPM is the last couple of oppterms, the early oppterms, and of course they savor of the earlier goal. And you probably will find in the last one or two oppterms that you get a different phraseology entirely. But that makes it awful easy to pilot one of these things. You can ride one of these things right on down, and it's all done by the drill. You test them, you test the question and you find out if the item is still reading and you go ahead. You don't test for terminal or oppterm because it's pretty obvious if you're doing it this way. And you make sure that it RRs and you carry on.

And with this pattern I began to suspect something, and can now tell you as an absolute lead-pipe cinch. Now look, this does not apply to a source list. A source list has to be tiger drilled. But if you have to tiger drill an item or put the big mid ruds in on an item to get it to fire, that is not the item you want. Now, that's revolutionary isn't it?

In the first place I haven't been putting in anything on items for a long time. But it suddenly occurred to me that you're all drilling items to get them to fire. You get it on a list and then you drill it to fire. If you've got to drill it to fire it's not it, because you can make almost any item on a list fire. How do you like that? You could tiger drill anything that RRed on listing and you could make it fire again, momentarily.

Well, you mustn't drill these items. There is where you are taking up all of your time. It's all in the senseless drill. I couldn't figure out what you were doing, but now I know what you were doing. You're drilling items, and you mustn't drill items, you just mustn't do it, because if it didn't fire, it isn't it.

Well now, let's take this goal here, "to scream." And you put down 49 scream." Well hell, that's out of the blue. The pc is saying, "Aw, scream, what's this, scream, what's this?" Noun form of the goal, so forth. You say it a couple of times, it'll RR. Oh, you might touch it up, take the suppress off, because they just suppressed it. Take the protest off because they just protested it. Something like that. You know it's there. Oh, it's forgivable. You've got to make it fire. But if you say, "All right, give me the negative form, who or what would oppose scream? Or screams? Who or what would oppose screams?" And the pc puts down everything under the sun, moon and stars, and you're going to have to tiger drill something to make it RR. Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha, it's just "no screams." If you get, "no screams" on the list, *bang* that's going to fire. You're going to *see* it fire. You're going to say it, it fires. That's it, that's all there is to it, bang.

There is no "null the list and go on down and null the list and get on the mid ruds. All right let's get on some mid ruds (let's see, we can waste another ten hours of auditing). Let's get in the mid ruds on all of the items in the bank, and so forth, and see if we can get the mid ruds in on the pc. So we see the pc is biting his fingernails. Let's get the pc in on biting fingernails, mid ruds, biting fingernails. *Ee-ee beinsstu-huh."*

What the hell's the matter with you? You haven't got the item, that's why.

Now look, as you go down the bank this is going to serve you in very good stead, because it's a number one test. I'm not just making fun of you. You're a knucklehead, and I-but I love you anyhow.

If you can't get something to go on the list, *pshhhew,* which when read back goes *psshhhew,* see, if you can't get that thing going pow, you haven't got the item. Most marvelous test in the world. You get the item without drilling. If you can get the item without drilling, it's the item.

Now this has its limitations because you can get other items without drilling. You are down in the middle of the bank, the pc can give you fifteen dozen locks, all of which fire, none of which belong there. You get the center item and however it fires.

But the pc does this trick. You list for a while, and the pc isn't satisfied with the final result. You call it, it fires. Pc says, "Oh no, that couldn't be it. It turns on mass, and it does this and that and the other thing." And you'll notice that-you don't depend on the pc's telling you-your tone arm is up here at four and a half, and when you give him the item, and you read it back to him, not when he finally accepts it, particularly, if it's the right item, you get a blowdown. It comes right down, that tone arm. That tone arm doesn't come down, you go on listing for a while. Only guide his listing, and get him to put the thing on the list straight. Soon as you've got the thing on there straight, once more the thing will fire, but the old one won't fire.

Now, you learn to work around with this fact that they fire without TD and you will be clearing people. But as long as you put in Tiger Drill buttons on items to get them to fire, as long as you null lists to get them to fire, you're going to wind up with the wrong item.

Just because something fires when you call it does not make it the right item, but if you have to *tiger drill* it to get it to fire it is pretty much of a cinch to be a wrong item.

Now, the only thing about this is, is once in a while, about one item in fifty, the pc has been sitting there chewing on it one way or the other, and has been refusing it. Let's say well, we found it in bank one, and it turns up again in bank three, and the pc has been chewing on it in bank one. Well you suddenly remember we've had this item on several lists before and it's always been refused, and we see it on this list again. Yes, it could be that it is suppressed enough so that it won't fire. But don't be deluded. Don't, don't be deluded by this, because the chances are even if you *do* get it to fire it's still wrong for the spot you're trying to put it in.

It's one of these things. That an item does fire, bang, when you read it back to the pc, it is not a guarantee. That you have to tiger drill it to get it to fire it is practically a guarantee that it is not the item.

And there's where all of your clearing time on 3M is going. There's where it's all going.

You are just not getting the items on the list.

Well, the reasons why you weren't getting the items on the list of course have to do with the fact you didn't have the top form of the GPM.

Now, on actual listing tests, and on a great many pcs, and a great deal of experience of this with this, I can tell you that the pc's bank is too heavily charged at the beginning of the case for the pc's confront to be capable of giving you the item. That's it. It-he's just too charged up. There's nothing wrong with telling him what the item is or running a bunch of test items in on him, you know. Is it "bringing the truth?" "bringing truth?" you know. Write them down on the list. Ask him if you can put this one down on the list, and that one. We'll eventually work out some where it doesn't upset the pc particularly, and you'll eventually get something to fire, and there it is.

Now, when you get away from the top, the pc's confront comes up because the bank isn't as jammed in the middle. But you now know that you've got to have items with the goal in them, expressed in them if all banks follow the track of the original banks on the track.

All of this is very interesting information. It is all quite usable in auditing. I have been actively slowing down your going into too many GPMs and jumping over and so forth, until I was sure that we had something that looked like the top of the GPM. This is another good try at this. This is not a guarantee that the goal "to be a self-appointed archangel in the Christian Science church"-which is very late on the track-this is not a guarantee that it will have all of these tops. But look, if you've got all these tops you can test for them, and if they don't fire, they don't fire.

And then in the next goal that you get down to, why, you've sure got all these tops again, and you can test those things out. My money is on the fact that they will continue to fire all the way down, because it's a gradient scale on the oppterm side, it's a gradient scale from the extreme accomplishment of the goal down to the nonexistence of the goal. And on the terminal side it comes from the nonexistence of the goal, increases down to the goal itself. And this looks to me like a very good rendition of this.

Now, there may be some other common points about this, and I'll be studying them and so forth. But knowing now what this dozen at the top here are if there are any more items or patterns around in there that might get missed it won't be very serious. So you can go ahead and plunge on with this.

I'm quite intrigued with the fact that the GPM is this pattern. I'm quite intrigued. And I was very intrigued to find out that in the goal "to create" that the pattern was very fixed, and that the pattern was extremely patterned. And that made me very suspicious, because when did a thetan learn how to do this if two hundred and sixteen trillion years ago he was obeying the perfect pattern?

Well, I'd say there were a few goals before this, and I expect sooner or later to run into the beginning of track with some such goal as "to know how to put a GPM together."

But anyway there is as far as we've gotten on this pattern.

Now, tests for the top terminal, for the top oppterm, rather, tests for the top oppterm have been very successful and we've made some good progress on that. The top oppterms we got we didn't get any higher on those we already had been testing than "bringers," or "people who-people who goal," or something like that. But we did get the "e-r" form, which was still two from the top. We want the noun form, itself.

I don't mean to muddy you up on that because all this will be published and these things will be rewritten. Before I rewrite them, however, I'm going to check a lot of later banks and get the information exactly fitted together, and it will be released at that time.

But this is good enough to use, and I think that it's very interesting that we had one pc who came in to see me today and he had a goal, and he told me, he told me that he-that nothing was doing him any good. And he had a goal "to be good." And I said, "Well, it doesn't do you-it does you no good. Is that right?" And he said, "That's sure right." And I said, "Well, then it's no good, isn't it?" And he said, "Aw, that's so true." And all of a sudden he-I said, "Well, that's your top terminal isn't it?" And he said, "Yeah, I guess it is," and he stopped saying any more about it. Now that's a mean thing to do to you, but I thought it was just too good.

Of course somebody with a goal "to be successful" has got a top terminal-is "no success," and he's dramatizing it like crazy. So if you are beating your brains out as an auditor wondering what's the matter with this guy, well, it's just "no success," you see. And the guy had a goal "to find," and you'd just be beating your brains out because you've got "no finds." And if you had a goal "to know," you'd probably have "no knowledge" up here, and the pc's going to hit that awful strong because that's him.

Only one other little datum I might give you is the goal fires much better with the pc in a terminal than an oppterm. Isn't that interesting? Then you get back on the track later. I think that's fascinating. The pc definitely comes up the terminal side, and definitely faces all the way the oppterm side, just going into it slightly.

Well, that's some more data on the GPM, and now that we've got it pretty well taped, and we've got it pretty well figured out so that you can get through it-actually you could get through it before without losing your skull-but now that you can get through it, now that you can get through it, those in the X Unit will find it's perfectly safe now to find your goals. Perfectly safe and so you've got till Friday because it's awful hard to run a GPM without the goal, and if you haven't got your goal by Friday well, we'll have to put you into the Y, and then put you into running GPMs without the goal. It ruins the case, you know, to do that, so don't put us up to that, don't make us guilty of that terrible overt. Go ahead and find the goals before

Friday. Okay?

Thank you very much.

Good night.