

DIRECTIVE LISTING

A lecture given on
18 April 1963

How are you today?

Thank you. Well, this is the what?

Male voice: The 18th.

The 18th of April, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and I'm going to talk to you now about directive listing and R3M2. The situation is evolving very neatly on 3M. Situation is well in hand. And if you want to be interested in something, or if you want to have more worries than you have at the present time, just audit some 3M. This is a guaranteed-this is a guaranteed method of absorption and worry. You can have more heart failure auditing as the auditor, doing 3M than the pc ever dreams of.

Now, pcs are very anxious to go down the bank, very anxious to run the GPM, and they get very ARC broke and they hate to be stopped, and, all of this sort of thing. And the auditor on his part, why he's-he's in one of these mental states which is, well, it's pretty grim! It's pretty grim! I'm getting my licks in now, on running it. I know what of I speak!

Now I myself didn't get much reality on auditing Routine 3M by being audited on it. And one of the reasons for that is, is I have probably one of the most indestructible RRs that ever emerged! You can be thankful for that. I miss a few items, or a couple of GPMs even and nothing much happens. The only time my RR ever went off was when I'd found -been put through a bank and found twenty items, without having the goal for that bank, it appearing that the bank was part of another bank. And my RR went off and we found the goal for it, for those twenty items, and of course it went right back on again and there's been no further trouble.

So I don't have a reality, subjectively, on the delicacy of most pcs' RRs. And yet I have now auditing experience that, shows me very definitely that pcs' RRs are very delicate. And you miss-well it's this delicate: You miss a couple of items, you know, bypass a couple of items and you find all of a sudden the pc's RR is dwindling, getting smaller, and will suddenly disappear, and you can't find any items on this pc. And that's apparently fairly ordinary.

The experience is more than just my auditing experience; it's been happening in Z Unit rather consistently. I began to see what the auditor is up against there, in this situation,

because there are only two things-now get this-there are only two things that can cause an RR to get smaller. That is successive item after successive item, an RR can get smaller, shorter. And that is a symptom of danger. And only two things cause it.

And the first of these is not having the goal for the GPM you are running. Well, now with the new directive listing, which we are using, this liability becomes much less. Because the items you are getting in directive listing are taken directly from the context of the goal. And, this only leaves the possibility that the goal might be slightly misworded. Instead of "to be successful" we have a goal "to succeed," don't you see? I mean we could be that close in.

But if this were the case, the goal would have R/Sed a lot on being checked out. Beware of these goals that R/S a lot. They RR and then they R/S-that doesn't apply to a goal halfway through a bank, because a real goal halfway through a bank will R/S. But, when you're checking and finding goals, you'll find a goal that R/Ses. And they've got a lot of-R/S turns on with an occasional rocket read, you can be absolutely certain that that goal is slightly misworded.

In other words, instead of, "to be a kingpin" you see, it's "to kingpin," give you an idea. Instead of, "to run a restaurant" it'd be "to be a restaurant," you get the application of it. In other words, there's something slightly wrong. Instead of "to be a cook"- "to be the cook," you see? And that much error

that much error in the wording of the goal will cause a goal on checkout to do a lot of R/S, and once -starts in by an RR or two, and then does an awful lot of R/S, and then goes blooey, and you can't get it to do anything else. Well, that kind of a goal by the way is very valuable-very valuable in Routine 2. You find a goal that does this, all you've got to do is tell the pc to give me some variations in the wording of this goal. And, if the pc starts out, it's "to be a cook," see, you've got this goal "to be a cook," and the pc starts out, "Well, to like food. To prepare food easily," well, all right, let him go on. But what you want is just a variation in the wording of the goal. Not a goal of similar context, you see, we don't want the similar concept, we want a varied wording.

Because it's something-we know that "to" and "cook" are probably right. But is it "to cook"? or "to be a cook"? or "to be the cook"? -which one is it? Now this gets us into directive listing on goals which is where we properly pick the thing up. Now when we have the goal that way, we mustn't suggest goals to the pc, because this upsets the pc like mad. But if we've got a goal, which is going bing bing, and R/Sing, and it RRs every once in a while, and then it goes R/S, then we can't get any RRs out of it, we know what we've got our hands on. And about the only thing that's going to cure this, in the final analysis, is directive listing.

We tell the pc, "All right, give me some goals of a similar context." He says, "Well, to like food, to eat, to never have anything to do with animals, to run a farm, to be the director of price control in the government, to elect the president. To. . ." Well, look-look, this pc's confront on the subject of goals, and so forth, is about the same as it is in the bank, which

means, terrible! See? It's because his confront is measurable directly proportional to the amount of charge you get off the case by running a bank, you see. And it's not directly proportional to the amount of confront that a pc does in a bank.

Now you can make a pc just confront lots of goals and do lots with goals. You can make a pc do all these things. But, the truth of the matter is, his confront comes up because you are in actual fact in the bank situation. You're in a dropped charge-it isn't the number of goals, it's the number of goals you discharge. In other words, by find-in finding goals, you must keep your tone arm action going.

If your tone arm action ceases, in the finding of goals, and you do list after list after that without finding one, then the pc's attention has hung up on a favorite goal. And you must get rid of that favorite goal. It is either the goal, or if you've never been able to get it to do anything, and so forth, you must change the pc's position in the bank.

And you do that by saying, "What goal would you postulate after-'to catch catfish,' had failed?" There is the wording which is used-"What goal would you postulate to catch-after 'to catch catfish,' had failed?" That's

you'd do this list, you see, and then null it the same as any other way and all of a sudden you'll find your tone arm motion has been restored.

Tone arm action ceases when you've gotten the pc's goal and gone across it or the pc has stuck on a favorite goal which is not due at this time to be run. It's his goal, it's somewhere in the track. But it can't be run. So you must move his attention. Well, the-one of the ways to do this is directive listing. Directive listing is directive to the degree that you just say, "Tell me the goal after this other goal has failed," that directs his attention, don't you see?

Well, we can go a little bit further than this. And we've got this goal, "to be a cook" and it RRed, and then it R/Sed, and then it went out, and nobody's heard anything about it since. Well, one of the ways of handling that is to make the pc give us another wording for that goal. And we can do this quite directly. And the pc's given us this long concatenation which finally winds up "to elect the president," and it isn't anything to do with being the cook. You've got to bring his attention back, "No, give me some goals with the word 4 cook' in them. Cook. Cook." And the pc says, "Oh, well, oh, why didn't you say so?" you know, and, "to be a cook, to be the cook, to cook, to have nothing to do with cooks, to never cook." Aha! That one RRed. And you say, "Thank you very much," and you tiger drill that one, and that's the goal.

That's quite interesting. But one of these near misses requires direction of the pc's attention to the right wording to make it run.

Well, now to get back to what I was talking about, the only thing that while you're running the GPM with Routine 3, that can cause an RR to shut off-there's only two things: Is

to get a wrong item or bypass an item, or list one wrong way to. This is all under the heading of actually wrong item, because a bypassed item means you got the wrong item, because you didn't get it in sequence. And, the wrong way to, well, you called a terminal an oppterm. So that again is a wrong item-and, so on. So, it actually comes under the heading of, you've handled even a right item, so as to make it a wrong item, or you bypassed the right item. You've done something. Just in that immediate framework. Nothing further than that. And you'll find the pc's RR is getting narrower on the subsequent items, if you find them at all. In other words, bypassing an item, or getting a wrong item, or listing one wrong way to, you can then give the same phenomenon as would appear if you were running a wrong goal.

Now we are running the goal "to be a cook"-this would be a wrong goal. "To be a cook," and we get the top terminal, top oppterm, and so on, which would probably be "cooks" or something like this. And, we get "cook" or "44 cooked" or something like this. And it's "to be a cook." It doesn't look wrong, does it? And, then we'll get down to the next one, we get the -we have a little trouble getting the top terminal. All right, that's fine. And then we get the second oppterm from the top and oh, we get that all right. And then we get the second terminal from the top, and we suddenly begin to realize that this pc's RR is getting awfully small. Well, of course, we haven't got the right goal.

If we go on getting RRs, why, the RR will shut off. We go on getting RIs, the RR will shut off. The shut-off RR, then, is adequately telegraphed to the auditor. The auditor knows all about it. You see, it isn't true that different RIs have different lengths RRs. That's not true. They're basically all the same length. And if you got an inch and a quarter RR on the top oppterm, you should get an inch and a quarter or even a little better on the top terminal and it should be an inch and a quarter on the second top oppterm, and an inch and a quarter on the second top terminal. In other words, we should go on there, and if anything the RR should improve a little bit, and certainly it should improve on the goal.

Well now, if the reverse happens, if we get a shortening RR, we know that one of two things are wrong. We've either gotten a wrong item or we have got a wrong goal. Now, with directive listing it isn't likely that we are going to get a very wrong goal. That is rather ruled out.

One of the ways we would become aware of this is the pc keeps putting down, "steam locomotives," and we're trying to run this "to catch catfish." And, what's going on here? And we keep directing him into catching catfish, don't you see? And we want a "caught catfish," or whatever the top oppterm is. And it just doesn't fire. And the top terminal is, "no caught catfish" or something of the sort, and that doesn't fire well. But we start getting other things firing, and, so forth. And we just can't seem to make it.

Now because auditors do have a lot of trouble making this, your first assumption is not that you have a wrong goal. But this is definitely a possibility. You can't get the items which would ordinarily belong to that goal, into that GPM, and they don't fire; obviously,

there must be something wrong with this goal. Of course, if you really want to ARC break a pc, start challenging a right goal; that's -sometimes even challenging a wrong one! This is one of the liabilities of the business.

And the other one, and much more likely, is that you've gotten the wrong top oppterm, or the wrong or-and the wrong or the wrong top terminal, and the wrong, or even the right top oppterm and the right top terminal, and the right second top oppterm, and then you caught the next one and by accident listed it wrong way to or something, and-wow, I did that. And immediately on the third top oppterm why, I didn't have any items. I didn't have any RR or anything. And I got a couple of little things on the list that RRed, but the RR from being about an inch long, was suddenly only about a quarter of an inch long. And then on the next-next item it didn't exist at all! Just nothing RRed. We had nothing but long falls.

Well, now there are those amongst us I am very sorry to say, who would say at this point, "Well, it's the pc's item and it doesn't really have to read anyway, so we'll just go on and find it." Yeah, you'd better blush! This-this is nonsense. Because the auditor has simply blinded himself to the fact that something is wrong and should be corrected.

So you know if you get a shortening or a vanished RR, there's one thing that is true: There's something-is wrong! And, the something wrong is with the items or the goal. And the second one you take, and look at of course, is the goal. You try to correct the items first. Now, if you've run this thing, six, eight items down into the bank, and it's all running fine, and they're right according to the lineup, and so forth well, of course, it isn't a wrong goal. It couldn't be a wrong goal, or it wouldn't have gotten that far. You wouldn't have found those items RRing. That's it-I mean, let's say, it's "to be a catfish" and "catfishishness," and so forth. Stuff like this is turning up in there. "Being a catfish," you know, RR, or "being catfish," RRed like mad. "The beingness of catfish," see, that kind of thing, you know.

This sort of thing all RRed. Well, you can't have a wrong goal there, don't you see? So it must have been that you omitted an item, or you got a wrong item, or you faked an RR, or you did something, and goofed. And the first thing to suspect is that your top oppterm and top terminal, since they're the most variable-now, from being the most fixed they've become the most variable-but your top oppterm or top terminal are wrong.

And the thing to do in that particular case, is go back and experiment with them, and see if something else fires in their place. And if that isn't the case, see if you haven't skipped a pair. You might have skipped a pair, don't you see. There might have been a terminal and an oppterm. Maybe the third oppterm and the third terminal, maybe you just skipped that pair. And somehow or other patched up so that they crossed in. And you got two bypassed items. Look for something like that. And, of course, the most obvious thing to look for-is you evidently-you will do this, sooner or later, because I just did it last night. Just carelessly list one backwards. Just like that. Even though it's staring you right in the face. All of a sudden the pc's wrapped around the telegraph pole, all ARC broke, and nothing going anyplace, RR

diminishing, dwindling, everything going to pieces.

In other words, now that we're listing by pattern with directive listing, you're pretty safe in running Routine 3M. It's very safe. Now, running it without a discovered pattern, was not safe. Because the pc's confront is not up to it. And you'd just -miss things all over the doggone place if you did that.

So there is only two things that can be wrong. And the most likely is that you've got a wrong item subhead-you've bypassed an item. Subhead-you've, opposed one wrong way to or subhead-you've got-you just picked up the wrong item. That's your most likely. And then the other one is, of course, that you've got a wrong goal. But if of course the proper 3GM wordings according to the pattern you have, has been firing on the pc, the possibility of that goal being wrong is very faint-very faint. And you shouldn't rack the pc up with it. But you mustn't rule that out as a possibility.

Well, that's about the only thing can go wrong. Now, if you want to know whether or not every RI should RR, and "Isn't it all right just to kind of apathetically go across the *ahhhhh*, the meter moved a little bit, and yeah, well it's supposed to be there, and so I'll just give it to the pc . . ." I know what you're up against. I had a tendenc-I've had a tendency to do this, you know. It's obviously the right item. Turning on somatics but it won't RR.

Well, that leads straight to disaster. Because you're not going to get anyplace from that point there on. The thing you've got to do is stop right where you are, correct the thing that prevents the RR from occurring. And that will be something that went just before, just ahead of what you are doing.

Nope. If you run a straight pattern, and if you run that pattern right on down that RR will improve, it'll get better, it'll get sparkier and spunkier, the goal will read better, and everything will go along beautifully. Soon as you miss one of those things, as soon as you miss, your RR will get smaller, and, tend to disappear, you don't get rocket reading items on your list and so forth.

Well that's the liabilities of 3M. But if you'll see that, as a prevention of doing something wrong, you can get in a happier frame of mind. Don't curse at it! Apparently, on the bulk of the pcs you will be auditing, you know right away when something is wrong, because you lose your RR. Well, you take old ironsides, he didn't ever lose his RR, so this has never come up, see? He had twenty items and most of them wrong-twenty items into the bank, without the goal. And, my RR shut off. Well, that's kind of the way it is.

But RRs apparently aren't that strong. They're fairly delicate. Now let me give you another-another item here, on this same subject. A pc in running 3M, if you're running from the top down, if you haven't picked up the goal, "to cause," or something like that off the backtrack, and you're trying to run this on this poor pc; if you've got his present time goal, it's got pain in it! It hurts! Those items hurt! He's very delighted to have them, and get rid of the

somatics, because he's had them for a long time. But it hurts! And every time you say that item to him you turn on somatics.

Let's say it's, "catching catfish," you see. And, you found this, and when he put it on the list, it fired, and when you called it back once, it fired, and so forth. You're going to run into this kind of a situation sometimes. You're going to call it again. "Catching catfish," you know, you didn't see the RR, it only went a full dial, and smoke came out the corner of the meter. And you call it again, and you want to make sure-you want to make sure, you want to be certain. You want to be certain. Whereas you don't have any certainty, you want to be certain about this, you see. So you call it again-so you call it again. So, you know-you know, perhaps the second time you call it, it's not going to be there as an RR. Third time it certainly isn't going to be there as an RR. And the fourth and fifth and sixth and seventh and eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth time you call it brother, it's not only not going to be there, the pc's going to hate your guts! Because every time you say it, you're blowing his head off! That's an interesting thing. You ever think about it, that the pc has something to do with the session.

I've tried to teach some of the people in W Unit this -that the pc has something to do with the auditing session. I'm having some success. Having some success. We're going to rig up something that when the pc dies a large bell rings, or something like this, so the auditor will be aware of something having happened. I'm sorry to be sarcastic. But I myself audit the pc in front of me. A little demonstration which we saw last night, I didn't see the pc in front of the auditor being audited. I saw the auditor going through the forms of auditing. And that I always frown on.

The forms of auditing should be used. But, of course, the pc is there to be audited. You don't abandon the forms of auditing, you just get good enough, so that you can audit the pc in spite of the form of auditing, and because of the form of auditing, and you're going to be all right. And, by the way, you'll find it's much better to use that form of auditing. Of course, there was one student who got much better results, he was permitted to audit up in East Grinstead. He didn't like being there -at that time we were separating, doing some course separation. And, they had to stay around awhile after they were terminated. And this pc took-was taken up to East Grinstead, and audited, and they got along much better, because the auditor was permitting the pc to eat stick candy all during the session. Well, the pc did much better, that's true. It's true, the pc did much better. That pc-no bad auditing came anywhere near the pc. The pc wasn't in-session, didn't get any auditing, and an auditor who would do that to a pc, or let a pc do that, would probably audit the pc very badly anyhow. Man, to keep the pc interested and sitting there, you have to feed him stick candy. I don't think that's the right way to go about it! Anyway-anyway, I'm in a vicious mood today!

The situation with regard to the discipline of auditing, is the pc in front of you feels. The pc in front of you has nerves. Now, of course you're clearing him, and eventually he won't

have any nerves, or be connected with any, and he'll be just doing fine! But at the moment you're auditing him, could I call to your attention the fact that the pc has a sensibility as to what is going on. And, you take an item that is anyhow strong enough or big enough to aberrate 90 percent of his life, and you're going to say to him-you're going to say to him, "Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Catching catfish! I'm trying to see if that rocket reads! Catching catfish! I didn't see if it rocket reads or not-catching catfish! I-it's-I-you see, I-I have to confront you when I say it, you know, and I don't get a chance to look at the meter, so I'll - I'll

look at the meter again. Catching cat-, no I didn't see the meter again - uh . . . " so forth. And you say, "Well, that doesn't RR! " Well, the question is: Did it RR? Well yes, when you called it the first time, it RRed. And after that the pc-a lot of pcs will do this, it isn't just a few of them, they put on the brakes! They do a total suppress. And they say, "No! No! Get those goddamn catfish off of me!" See? And the auditor says, "I want to see if it reads. Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Catching cat- ' it isn't reading yet-catching catfish! Cat-." Oh, my God, he's got these knives going through the pc's chest, you see, and the pc is trying to hold this stuff up. So what happens? You don't get any read.

Now, after that nonsense, you could put in your mid ruds. By all means put in the big mid ruds, and preferably even an eighteen-button Prepcheck, that would be good and time-consuming. And, you get this thing all put in, you see, and you finally get it all straightened up, and you say once more, "Catching catfish!" You get a rocket read, see. So then you say, "Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Cat ." And the pc says, "No! No! No! No!" He may not even be sitting there saying anything, you know. But internally that's the way he's going. "No!" You know? Because it's an oppterm. He's been fighting them all of his life!

So, you say, "Well, that doesn't rocket read. Well, probably have a wrong goal. Probably have the wrong GPMs. Probably have the wrong reactive mind! Probably have the wrong thetan! Possibly even have the wrong-probably even have the wrong auditor! Maybe we're in the wrong room!" See, you could trace it back like this. And what does it come from? Comes from the fact that you should understand in running 3M that items have *kksssr* in them. They got *skkkrrr!* And the more you say them, and the more you chant them at a pc, and the less certain you are, and the more nonsense you go through, the less likely you are to keep a rocket read on.

You could say it this way: I'm studying the delicacy of RRs. And the delicacy of RRs are this: The pc listed it, you give the pc, "I'll give you the next rocket reading- next-to-the-last rocket reading item on the list,"-the next-to-the-last, so the pc doesn't make a mistake. And you say, "Fishhooks! That doesn't rocket read." "That doesn't read," you would say. "And now I will read you the last-the last rocket reading item on the list. Catching catfish! That rocket reads. That is your item. Now, would 'no catfish,' or 'no catching catfish,' or 'not catching catfish,' " whatever it was, "oppose catching catfish?" And the pc says, "Oh, yes,

yes!” And you get your blowdown-Zzzzzrrrrmmmm! Sometimes you get your blowdown earlier.

And, then you say, “All right, thank you. How does that relate to the goal?” And the pc says, “Oh! It's an absolute negative of the goal. Catch

well, no, it makes the goal, but somehow or another I'm agin it.” Whatever it is. And you say, “Thank you very much!” Write it down on your auditor's report, write down your next question, “Who or what. . . “

“Now here is the question,” you say, “Who or what would oppose catching catfish?” And actually that's all the actions you take in 3M. See? You don't take other actions. No. You get it-your trouble occurs when you've gotten yourself all set, you say, “I'll read you the last rocket reading item on the list,” or usually, now we have directive listing, the only rocket reading item on the list, and, you say, “All right,” the pc's put it down, pc all very bright, and you say, “Catching catfish!” And, it doesn't rocket read! Ooooooooh! And according to pattern that's what belongs there, *oh-oh-oh-oh-oh!*

Well, try to get some more items that measure onto it more closely. But watch it, man! If that's the item that really belonged there, you gonna stray somewhere! And it didn't show up till just now. So try to get the right item down. Do everything you can to get the right item down. And if you still can't get the right item down, recognize that you have got a wrong item ahead of you, usually, or you've done something silly with something just back of this! Don't try to take it out with the item “catching catfish.” In other words, don't go at it on the basis I was just showing you.

“Catching catfish! I will read you now the only rocket reading item on the list: Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Catching catfish! Cat-catching catfish ... On this item, has anything been suppressed? On this item, is there anything you've been care-careless of? On this item, is there any foolproof? On this item, should we use Neverleak? On this item, *za-bwa-bla-wrarahrhahah, yap-yap-yap!*” I mean, I'm telling you! There's no point in it, man! There's no point in it.

That's the right item. It's the only rocket reading item on the list, you completed your listing, you call it, you're going to get an RR. If you don't get an RR you're wrong. Doesn't do you any good to try to drill it, or pray to Allah, or throw coins out there in the wishing well, it won't do you a bit of good. It's a wrong item.

And something before that is wrong. It'll-either you didn't get the item on the list, or an item just ahead of this is wrong, and the first thing you consult of course, always, is the list you are working on right at the moment. And you try everything you can to make that work out. And if that doesn't work out, and you can't get a rocket reading item off that when called back to the pc, then it's an earlier item that is flubbed up. You've missed something, or you've done something there.

That's what you put your time in on. Is looking for what's wrong right here with the 3M. Not trying to get this thing to read. And you call it once. Don't you call it six, seven, eight, twelve, fifteen, eighty-two times.

Now, this brings us down, if we're going to be that sharp, this brings us down to directive listing. Now, what happens when the pc says, on the goal "to catch catfish" the pc says, "That's the '-ers form'-yes, on the plot there, that's the '-ers form.' So, therefore that's Ercatchers! Ha-ha! Yeah! That's-that's the item. Ercatchers! Uh-" so on. You gonna let him flounder around, burn up all your auditing time that way? No you're not! You say, "Yes, it's the -er form, that-that's right. Now just for fun, take a look at this.. ." and you make out what it is. In other words, you've got to know the item better than the pc. Because the pc is down in the middle of the bank. He can't confront it, because he's under all the duress of charge with relationship to this item. But you're not! And you can figure out what that item is.

Now, I'll give you a couple of lessons on this, on directive listing. Two things I've learned, is gobbledygook isn't right. I mean, he tries to give you some gobbledygook of some kind or another, just to comply with the form.

And they aren't words that make any sense whatsoever. They don't make sense. It doesn't matter if they're not English, but they don't make sense! Don't expect them to read! They might even read! But you're shortly going to run out of RR.

Let me give you-"It's the -er form." Well, the only thing you can seem to get there is a "catcheter." You don't know what it is, pc doesn't know what it is, nobody knows what it is, and for some mysterious reason it rocket reads. So you say, "Ha, well that's it." And you finally find out that it's just a plain "catfish catcher," see? And, you'll find out that it's-the item actually makes sense! The item makes sense! And you're going to see sooner or later people with directive listing trying to make gobbledygook work.

I had an - I had an example of this - I had an example of this. I had a couple of words on a line plot, when I was auditing, and they didn't make much sense, and I let them go by! They didn't make any sense to me and by George, we had a wrong item! And as soon as we got the thing straightened out and they did make sense, and so forth, they rocket read, and we went ahead beautifully.

The point I'm stressing here, is even though you have those forms, don't try to gobbledygook it. Because gobbledygook won't work. But sometimes it looks a little gobbledygooky, let's get the idea of "to be Catholic." Let's say that somebody had a goal like that. Got it down in the Vatican or somewhere, they got implanted, and "to be Catholic," you know. And you get down to the "-ness" form of the goal. And you say, well that's obviously the beingness of a Catholic. But by George, that doesn't work! And you finally find out that it's "Catholicness." Makes sense, doesn't it? Catholicness. It isn't an English word, but it's a perfectly decent concept. It's the "-ness" ness of being a Catholic. See? And Catholicness,

you'll find out will fire right at that point, very nice.

So, trying to bend it around, or the pc trying to bend it around

“Cathness-uh-catholness, uh-uh-uh-uh-nesscath! Uh.. .” Isn't going to work! It just isn't going to work! Yet you'll see pcs try this. Well, you've got to be good enough as an auditor to look at that thing, and say, “Well, his goal is to be a Catholic, uh -what would it be? '-ness' form of the goal, the beingness doesn't seem to operate here. It's Catholicness!” So you finally, after he gets, “cathness” and “nesscath” and “Nescafé,” you finally say, well-you finally say or say even earlier than that, you say, “Let's try Catholicness.”

“Catholicness!” he says! “Catholicness! Ha-ha! Didn't think of that! Ha!” Of course he never thought of it. That's why you're the auditor and he's the pc. Because he's right in the middle of the living lightning. And it's living lightning, man! And you can't think! You wait till you run a bank on somebody someday “to be stupid.” You really want to have a picnic! Oh-ho-ho-ho! It's hard enough to think in some kind of a bank “to be bright!” But in one of these banks, “to be stupid,”-it's gorgeous!

And what are you going to run into! What are you going to run into? You're going to run into gobbledygook! He's going to try to follow the form, but he can't make it integrate, and you've got to sit there as the auditor, and direct his attention to what he ought to put down there. Otherwise, what's going to happen? You're going to start running out of RRs, you're going to start bypassing items, the next thing you know something is wrong way to, and the next thing you know you may be over in some other bank. There's no telling what's going to happen!

Now look! The liabilities of a wrong item are so great-the liabilities of a bypassed item are so great-the liabilities of straying into another bank are so great, in terms of just the mechanics of auditing, trying to hold the pc in-session. In terms of the number of somatics and the amount of pressure that turns on, on the pc. The-in terms of ARC break and so forth, these things are actually so magnitudinous that you must do everything possible to prevent them. And that's what directive listing is for.

Now, you've got the bank. You've got the-you've got a bank pattern. Now, the bank pattern you've got at this particular stage, is not, perhaps, the perfect bank pattern. It's awful close to it-it's awful close to it, particularly in its upper and lower reaches. The upper, fourteen, or even the upper eighteen or twenty, and certainly the lower dozen-omitting the two lowest oppterm, which vary on every goal, that's very, very set. That's very, very patterned.

Now, how patterned the middle ground is, I can't actually guarantee. Nor can I guarantee that something hasn't been bypassed through that goal, because I don't particularly suffer from this sort of thing. But I tell you why

why that bank is issued. It's issued just for directive listing. Now, it's actually my fifteenth GPM. I think it's the fifteenth. It's some such number. And I was running out earlier GPMs and straightening them out very neatly, and I became aware of the fact that we had to know some data. And amongst the data that we had to know is did you get knocked off if only half of the bank was run, or that sort of thing. That's all in a guinea pig frame of mind. And also, I realized that we had to have the basic fundamentals of a bank. Well, the way to get the basic fundamentals of the bank was just to sit down and grind them out under every possible combination. And, I would say this sounds very heroic, and I could say, well, I gave my all for you, and so forth. I could go into it that way. As a matter of fact it was an auditor flub! The auditor started looking this over that far back on the track. And I complained. I said I'm in the middle of the living lightning, here, man! And we're going to establish the character of the bank back this far on the track? *Haaaaaaahhh!* Because we certainly should know the character of the bank. And the auditor went ahead and established- started running this bank. So, that bank is so bad, and so beefy, that of course you *had* to get the right pattern, or you would have got killed in the pc's chair by the amount of charge. So I didn't have much choice!

But anyway, I was going back on the track to see if we couldn't establish what the exact pattern was. And if you'll notice, there was a lot more to the GPM than there appeared earlier. And with the number of cases now I've seen run in the top hampers-nobody finds them! Just nobody finds them! And early on in the first few banks I ran I didn't find them.

So it's an unconfontable situation. Because there's too much charge. And confront is in direct ratio to the-to the amount of charge taken off. And the pc can confront-the more charge is taken off. So anyway, I went all the way back on the track, and there I was, and I got all the data, and stretched it out, and one of the reasons I'm very chary about putting it around is that's the most wicked thing-the bank-that there is. Which is of course "to create." Rrrrrr!

Of course, every one of its items that has a positive create form in it is busy creating. And they can create more mass and more answers and more this and more that so it's obvious that if you took it out of that bank, and that bank evaporated, why then of course you have a correct rendition of what the pattern is. Now much to my amazement, it holds true later on the track and it holds true on other pcs. Not because they're told so. The point here, in actual fact, is if the pc isn't run, guided very closely to this pattern, his RR goes off. So therefore the pattern has value. Now there will be other patterns, I'll pick them up, I'll straighten this one up, and absolutely shape it up, and there will be patterns for various types of goals. Don't you see? But you can extrapolate it from the just "to (ver " form of goal. You can

you can figure out what it is, because it's all the same. And it's a perfect pattern. Now directive listing, then, has to do first with the accuracy of the pattern. Directive listing was not very successful when you didn't have a successful pattern. And when the auditor doesn't know what he's trying to do, you don't of course have very successful directive listing.

Now, an auditor who gives a pc a bunch of gobbledygook, "Nescafé and other things

like that, that's for the birds. But an auditor has to give some suggestions because the pc is just not likely to pick it up. Actually, the pc will go on listing and listing and listing and listing and listing, and will practically list himself into the ground. Where as a matter of fact all he has to put on the list is one correct item, and bang! The charge is gone! That's it! Sometimes they have to list a few more to get the edge of it off.

But the point I'm making here is that directive listing is kind. And, nondirective listing totally permissive, psychological approach to life, you know, "What do people do? Oh, they just do. Yah!"-isn't going to get you anyplace! Because you-understand where you've got the pc, man! You just poured him over Niagara Falls in a barrel! And just as he left, you put in the next Fourth of July's entire stock of fireworks and a match! You put the lid on, and over the Niagara Falls he goes! And you're not going to help him out, huh? Whoa, brother! Of course, if you've got it in for him, why, go ahead, by all means, say, "Go on and list!"

Now, the main thing that's going to give you trouble at least for a while unless we get absolute patterns straightened out on it, things going to give you trouble is the top oppterm, and the top terminal. Now, these are characterized as the final achievement of the goal. It is the nounal, final achievement of the goal. That is what the top oppterm is. And the top terminal is simply negative -negative whatever that was. It's a negation of it.

Now, at-this leaves an awful lot to be-to be looked at. And because it's first on the bank, and it's first right up the top, and it's the first thing you're going to find, if you find it wrong, as you drag on through, your RR's going to shut off before you've gone five, six items. All of a sudden you've got no RR. Well, you don't look always at those to be wrong. But you look up toward them, and if you cannot find anything has been wrong way to, and nothing has been bypassed, and it all seems to be straight, and you haven't had any trouble, look for what you had trouble on. Look for the longest list you had to do, you know. That's an awful good tip. The earlier longest list, and so forth, good tip on that. You finally have to come back up to the top oppterm and top terminal ' and take a look at them again, and see if you can get something else functioning.

Because they're the most likely to have thrown it out. Now what are they? Well, actually they're what they are in the pc's aberrated consideration, having postulated the goal. He postulated the goal, so what is the final form of it? Now, he's going to try to sell you all kinds of final forms that don't have anything to do with the goal.

Well, he-I'll give you an example. You've got the goal "to be a tiger" and he's going to give you "a brilliant, beautiful animal." Nuts! It never will be! See? It'll be "tigers" or "the tigers" or something like that. Nor will it be "tigerness." That's a lower action-that's a lower item, see? And it's not going to be "tigerishness" or anything like that. It's not going to be one of those lower items. It's going to be something like "tigers," you see?

When we know some more about this, it'll be even we found a lot of them right. I don't

think it's such a thing as "been tigers" or "becoming tigers" or something like that. But, you get into a-into some randomness. Now that's dead easy on "tigers." "To be a tiger." Oh, for heaven's sakes, that's nothing. Find that any day of the week. How about a goal like this -how about a goal like this: "To be the object of a whirlpool." Now, what's the top of this thing? Well, you say, "Obviously it's the object of a whirlpool." But that's probably the last thing that'll ever occur to the pc. It'll be "a whirlpool," is probably the first thing the pc will try to give you. All sorts of things of that character. But these goal wordings are tricky.

Now you take "to be the cook." Now you get "to be the cook." "The cook" is-what's the top of the oppterm? It's probably "the cook" or something of that sort. Well, fine. It's what rocket reads, of course. Now you oppose that and what do you get? Well you've got a number of combinations, and they're liable to vary from pc to pc. But it's not "never the cook," but it might be. "Not the cook," "No, the cook," you've got these various negative choices, you see. And, remember that you can have a combination of this sort: "the not-cook." You can throw those negatives into the body of the thing.

And possibility is that you sometimes get a negative that turns out to -a double negative turning out to be a positive. That mustn't be ruled out as a possibility. It might make sense. But those two will most easily rocket read. Almost anything will rocket read up there. Oh, even the wrong one will rocket read, oh! Isn't that horrible! Ooooh! Naturally, in a bank, "to catch catfish," "catfish," "caught catfish," "catfish," "a catfish," "a caught catfish," "a catfish catcher," all of these things are liable to produce an RR. So your RR is not too reliable.

Your best test is having gotten them, they RRed, they opposed properly, your RR then didn't dwindle in finding subsequent items. So those things should be considered to be in a state of being tested, even when you're up to about the twelfth RI in the bank. This bank is running all right, this bank's running fine, along about number six, nothing untoward had happened, I would start to relax about the top oppterm and the top terminal. But I'd keep them in mind that long.

Now, as far as wrong goals are concerned, there isn't much probability of finding a wrong goal or listing a wrong goal. Because the worst you would get would be the two top items that would be wrong and it'd suddenly become apparent to you that something was awfully wrong here somehow or another. But you should have been forewarned. The goal probably R/Sed-the thing has never been seen to read properly. There's something else goofy about this thing. And-and get this as the positive test-by the time you get down to the sixth or eighth item, the goal ought to be reading like a buzz saw. It ought to be reading beautifully.

The goal does not read well in the first four items. Well, of course, that's kind of late. But listen! If you found these items and they did rocket read, then you have a goal that is quite similar to them, even if it is the wrong goal, and it should be very easy, just on the process of saying, "Give me some variations for this goal" to get the right goal.

Well, I hope I haven't worried you too much! This is a worrisome subject! And I hope I haven't disturbed your sleep or this evening's session! In actual fact, if you look over the very few things that can be wrong, you will then stop being nervous about all the other nonsense that you may worry about. Because only those things can be wrong that I have enumerated and talked to you about in this lecture.

Actually, the most fun in auditing I think I've ever had is auditing 3M. And the most interest and the most violent a pc has ever been will be manifested in 3M. The pc's very interested. You can't stop a pc from going down a bank, or getting audited to Clear, with anything, once he's started. Once he's started you won't be able to stop him.

You can find somebody's goal and then he isn't too keen to have the first item found. But one fine day, if you want to see some bird who has found his goal-his goal has been found, and he doesn't seem to want to be audited from that point on, just get him in a casual conversation on a meter, and see if you can't find his top oppterm. And he won't stop then-that'll be that! That'll be that. If a goal is very close to present time it turns on lots of somatics. And they keep him very interested, keeping ahead of his own somatics.

All right? Well, that is the score with regard to directive listing. And that's a lot of the whys and wherefores back of directive listing. It is not a method of evaluating for the pc. You don't evaluate for him. You just tell him what the next item is he should put down.

Thank you very much.

Good night!