QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GOALS ASSESSMENT, BEHAVIOR OF PC

A lecture given on
10 August 1961

Thank you.

Okay. This is the 10th of August 1961.

"If a pc dopes consistently throughout the Goals Assessment, not getting a lot together but running a list by repeater technique, does one keep on bringing him up to present time?" I should say not. "Or does one go on repeating goals because one is addressing the reactive rather than the analytical mind?" Very interesting. Probably requires an orientation on the . . what you're doing. I probably ought to sit somebody down and take a piece of his goals list and show you how you run it. I mean that would be about the most satisfactory answer to this. Runs like this.

Pcs audit, whether they're asleep or awake, and you'd expect no response from a pc of any kind whatsoever while you were doing a Goals Assessment on the pc after you've gotten the goals. He doesn't have to say anything. Nothing in the Auditor's Code that says he has to say anything. There is no pc's code. you can tear that out of Book One. I didn't write it in the first place. Written by John W. "Astounding" Campbell, Jr. who, the older he gets the more astonishing he is. And so on.

There is no pc code. The pc doesn't have to behave. There is no behavior factor involved. And you ask this pc for some goals. Well, he's supposed to come up with some goals, and if he doesn't come up with some goals, you hit him or kick him or do something with him and make him come up with some goals. You understand?

Pc has no responsibility for the conduct of a session. That's it. And don't expect that a pc does have any responsibility for the conduct of a session because he doesn't. You're the auditor. You're supposed to know what you're doing. You're supposed to know what he's doing. So you get the session going and you get him to run some goals. And as soon as you get the goals on a list, you null them. Well, he doesn't have to say a thing. He just doesn't have to say a thing. I read them over about three times and they look like they're dying out and so forth. I read them about two more times and they're dead. Another goal, I read it about three times; it looks like it's getting tougher, I just skip it. put it in as still there. Got the idea? Don't try to do anything else with that goal. It looks like it's going to stay, so I just let it stay. And I won't read a goal more than about five, six times anyhow. If it doesn't null in that long a period or that short a period and so forth, leave it. You're in no rush.

There is no anxiety about getting these goals erased. Actually, it's quite invalidative to the pc for you to be in an anxiety about it.

And I think basically, probably what you're trying to do in running goals, is you're probably trying to get rid of the goal rather than just inspect the goal. You expect the pc possibly to answer up or think about the goal or pay some attention to the goal while you are reading it. Any one of these things could be part of this same situation, you see. Or you're running the Goals assessment with the rudiments out, which is highly probable, or you don't pick up the ARC breaks during the session.

You know, there's something called interim rudiments. You know, pcs an get present time problems and things of that character while a session is .n progress. And you see an ARC break come up with a pc . . well, let's not fool around, because I can tell you, absolutely guarantee, that a small flub on m auditor's part will blow up to become an ARC break within a half, to one and one-half hours. You may not see it at the time it happens. You may not see it explode but it will come up later. Oh, you didn't know that, huh. Ha-ha. I can see an ARC break in a session coming, oh, my God, ages before the pc blows up. I've listened to them over speaker systems and things like that, you know. And I look at my watch and I say, "Well, one-half hour to an explosion."

Well, the explosions actually aren't necessary. You get an ARC break and you don't handle it, or the pc gives you an origin or you don't handle it, or something goes wrong with your TRs and then it's not handled by some rudiments process, you see, and you can count on an explosion of some kind or another occurring sometime later, but it's the most interesting thing. I mean it will be half an hour to an hour and a half, and there it goes.

Well, see, there goes a TR or there goes a rudiment of some kind or mother. And then we say, "Well, it didn't affect him and nothing happened to him," see. So we don't pay much attention to it, and then a half an hour to an hour and a half later, all of a sudden we get an explosion on some entirely disrelated and apparently quite different thing. Worth knowing, isn't it?

Now, the safe way to audit is to patch up the pc's ARC breaks whether they exist or not. Got that? Let's just make a rule. Patch them up whether they exist or not. And you all of a sudden won't have a pc going this far out. When you think that the pc looks restive because you have flubbed an acknowledgement or something like that, well, just go ahead and insist that you have, you see, and take the thing up. Get it? That's you, then, taking responsibility. Otherwise, the pc is forced into taking responsibility for the session. And of course, the moment he takes responsibility for the session, he goes out of session.

So that if you insist on your rudiments being in, you can make a frightful bore out of yourself and still be quite right, you know. The direction to err on the TRs is to insist that they are out, and the direction to err on the rudiments is to insist that they've got to be patched up. That's the direction to err. If you're going to make mistakes, make mistakes in that direction. You can become pitifully boring as an auditor, apparently. Somebody else listening to the session would say, "Oh, my God!" You know? "How horrible." You know, it's like this.

The pc says, "Well, uh, I did have a goal. Uh, yeah, I had a goal like that once. Uh, a goal to sell curtain rods."

And you say, "Okay." And he looks at you a little bit oddly. And you say, 'Well now, do you know I acknowledged that?"

And he says, "Well, I uh, uh . . ."

And you say, "Well, all right. Now what was that about curtain rods again?"   And he says, "Well, I think I had a goal once. I'm not quite sure, to have curtain rods . . to sell curtain rods I think it was, and so forth."

And you say, "Well, all right. Sell curtain rods, all right. Sell curtain rods. That's good. All right. Good."

And he says, "What was that all about," you know? But he won't cause m upset.

Now, this will cause an upset. He says, "Well, I had a goal once to sell curtain rods."

And you say, "Good." And he looks at you kind of odd. And you say, "All right. What's another goal?" taking a goals list. Actually, you don't know and sometimes he doesn't know whether he's had an upset or not. But he might have thought that you didn't adequately acknowledge this goal "to have curtain rods," you see.

All right. Well, this is going to build up, and this is going to build up. There's a possibility that this will build up through the minutes, through the tens of minutes, and another little one hits, you see. And another little one hits. All of a sudden, on some disrelated subject, he suddenly has a present time problem about his car parking or something, you see. This has flown in, and before you have a chance to handle it, he insists that you didn't.

Well, the whole argument is based on this oddity about the mind: the things that go wrong are not things that are known. The known things don't go wrong. It's the unknowns. And if you're looking for the source of an ARC break, you must look for an unknown area. If you're looking for a breakdown of a

session, you must look for something that both you and the pc have overlooked. You got that? If you want to waste time take up those things you already know about.

All right. I'll show you a very fast way here to patch up an ARC break of some kind or another. The pc says, "Well, I had a goal to sell curtain rods."

And you say, "Mm-hm."

And the pc says, "Did you get that?"

You say, "Mm-mm."

And the pc says, "Well, sell curtain rods, you know, sell curtain rods."

"All right."

Now, on the face of it . . now, on the face of this situation . . it appears that your lack of acknowledgement at that point upset the pc. This is the way it appears. And remember, this is a universe of appearances. And if all the appearances weren't somewhat fallacious, the universe wouldn't be here. See, there's little curves on these lines. So you assume at once that it wasn't that acknowledgement . . yourself privately. You can pay token to the fact that well, you didn't acknowledge and weren't terribly enthused about this horrendous goal that was going to wreck the whole universe about selling curtain rods. But you plunge at once on the basis of "Was there an earlier goal I didn't acknowledge? Was there an earlier one I didn't acknowledge?"

And he says, "Mmmmmmmm . . ." He'll always find one.

You get what I'm talking about? You give a cheery "aye-aye" to what he just said, and you think that's okay, and you do acknowledge, and you do handle that situation. And then you go back and handle the underpinning which might have caused this later upset.

You assume that any time a pc is upset, there's been an earlier upset he hasn't demonstrated. You got that? It's an unreasonable assumption perhaps, but you will always find that he will find it. It is an amazing mechanism The pc has an ARC break about the fact that the window dropped. By all means, listen to the ARC break about the window dropping, but find the ARC break that happened earlier. And you'll always find the earlier one, and for some reason or other, it'll always blow out the window dropping. And that makes for awfully fast auditing. Terribly fast auditing.

An auditor who is continuously involved in patching up ARC breaks and patching up present time problems has just not been alert earlier in the session. You see that? Just hasn't been alert. That's all. The auditor is the doped-off one. He hasn't been alert.

The auditor who's continuously involved, and having to rerun rudiments and patch up those ARC breaks and patch up those present time problems that occur during the session, and that sort of thing, there were lots of them that went by that he didn't notice, and they finally culminated into an upset which interrupted the session.

You see what the mechanism really is here. It's those little first unknown upsets, the not-recognized, the not-seen upsets, which then build up into the visual ones. The hidden upset is what you're really looking for. So if you go and spend three-quarters of an hour now on running the ARC break about the window dropping or the lack of an acknowledgement or something like that, you're being utterly foolish because it hasn't anything to do with it. Chat was merely the one where it got so bad that the pc went out of session.

Well, where did he start out of session? Pcs never go at right angles out of session. It would have to be really horrendous to get a pc to go right angles out of session. They drift off at about an angle of about twenty degrees to the session line. you got the idea? They're a little bit out, and then a little time goes on, and they're a little bit out, and there's a little bit more out, and then little bit more out, and a little bit more out, and a little bit more out, and all of a sudden it becomes noticeable. But they've been drifting out at a

twenty degree divergence from the course of the session here for maybe a half m hour to an hour and a half, before they really went out. you got it?

Now, if this happens early in the session . . you just start the session, the pc goes out at right angles, apparently . . oh, well, it was your session yesterday, and you didn't pick it up. Got the idea?

This actually puts you in a rather comfortable frame of mind. It puts you as cause over the actual situation because you're not now in a bad condition of thinking that you consistently do things that are bad as an auditor that causes the pc to get this upset. And you can get yourself pretty upset as m auditor, as a matter of fact, if you think that these things are actually what is upsetting the pc, you see. Because you are going along the line of attributing the cause of your upset as an auditor to the wrong target, see. You're saying, "Well, my auditing incompetence is demonstrated by the fact that I didn't prevent the window from dropping suddenly." You know? "I didn't protect this pc one way or the other." Well, the actuality is . . is that the pc suddenly was that nervy and went out that suddenly, and so forth. Your incompetence as an auditor is actually demonstrated by not picking up the Little ones. Those little ones. Those little twenty degree departures from the course of session way back, you see.

It's quite interesting to take a pc . . and you should actually run a pc this way once, severely, to get the point very well subjectively. But pc has an ARC break. Pc dopes off. Pc goes any which direction but being interested in own case and in the session. You know, pc does anything. Instantly assume there was something happened an hour and a half to a half an hour ago, or in the former session. You see? The second you see this "out of sessionness," you just make the assumption, true or not, that something went wrong yesterday or earlier in the session today. You got it? And you just go ahead and look for it. And take them all up, you see, one right after the other. Go down the line exhaustively. Find out which TR and which rudiment and which where and... "When I was auditing you yesterday, did you have a present time problem?" See, running rudiments for yesterday. "Did you have a present time problem while I was auditing you yesterday?"

"Well, no. No, not really."

"Did you have an ARC break with me yesterday?"

"Oh, no, no, no, no, no. Oh, no. I had no ARC break with you."

The needle drops. You say, "Well, what was the ARC break that you had with me yesterday?"

"Well, I thought actually that you began the session rather abruptly."

Well, boy, that is a session and a half ago, don't you see. Now, if you just, as an exercise and to give yourself a good reality on this thing, if you start picking up "out of sessionness," which includes dope-off, see . . dope-off is just another variety of going out of session. Flying out of the chair, throwing down the cans, or walking out of the room, or doping off . . these are all methods of retreat, aren't they? See, they're methods of "get out of here." So, if this situation existed as it went along the line, certainly something must have steered it there. Now, the pc did want auditing, and actually it takes a considerable volume of reasons why he shouldn't have it. It takes a lot to push him out. Got the idea?

Just as an exercise, go back and track it arduously, painfully, painstakingly. Lose all the auditing time you want to lose doing it. Cause another upset with the pc as far as you're concerned. You're doing it. But if it's causing an auditing upset with the pc, I'll clue you: It's there. There is an earlier one. There are several earlier ones. If the pc is now upset that you are looking for them, it is simply the fact that he is being restimulated by your looking for them. And his restimulation is what you're getting the argument over. Got it?

So if you want to be a real smooth auditor and have your pc always in session and always winning and always gaining, stop concentrating on trying to be so alert and so much on the qui vive and so interested in the pc's case. Stop worrying about that. Worry about your mechanics. Make those things real good, and assume that every time your pc departs from session either subjectively by doping off, boiling off, going unconscious, retreating in that direction, or attacking you as the auditor, or actually blowing the

session or starting to blow session, just assume immediately that you are looking at a chain of things that have no foundation in the incident which seemed to bring them out. you got that? Now, just assume that and then go look for the chain. And maybe it makes it very explicable to you here if I say don't fixate on the effect end of the line.

You see, the pc's going out of session, retreating subjectively or objectively, either way . . if you treat that as cause of the upset, of course, you're going to lose because you are looking at the effect of something. Well, what is it the effect of? It is actually the effect of a concatenation. And the least you'll get off the thing is a lot of unkind thoughts on the part of the pc, you see. Your pc's been doing something. You know, pc's had some disagreements here, and there are some backflashes as you slide back down the line and look for this.

Give you a very . . example. Pc throws down the cans. l his is pretty extreme, see. Pc throws down the cans and says, "Well, there's just no sense in telling you one more time because you just aren't listening to me."

Well now, there's no reason why you should at this point assume that this is factual. The pc said it, yes. The pc has become aware of it, yes. But your assumption at this moment should be that there's a chain. And that is the golden datum: that you are looking at a chain. And if you try to treat it as anything but a chain, you are not at cause.

A crude sort of an approach which is factual and not usable but very crude would be, "What was the first time you tried to . . you thought you had better get out of this session?" That isn't a usable statement, but it is a summation of what you're trying to do. And you say, "What's the first time you tried to get out of this session?" In the first place, it's too accusative, in the first place. It's too this, it's too that, but that's what you're really trying to do.

Pc throws down the cans. you say, "What was the first time you tried to get out of this session?" "Have you tried to get out of any earlier session?" "Have you thought you should not be in any earlier session with me?" That's what you're actually trying to do, you see. And boy, that needle will start wiggling. You'll just be amazed. You say, "Well now, you were sitting here. Everything was running along fine, and look-a-here, all these ARC breaks were occurring, and I didn't even notice it." And then that'll learn you that when the pc suddenly goes, you know, at you, something like that, pick it up, you know, pick it up right now. And you say, "Well, was something wrong with that acknowledgement? Was something wrong with that situation there, just now?"

And the pc says, "Oh, no." (You notice your needle drop.)

Right away, same rule applies. You noticed it, so there must be a hidden one. And you say, "Well, is there any earlier time you disagreed with one of my acknowledgements?"

"Oh, yes. No, no. No, no, no, no, no, no, except, uh . . ." Got the idea?

So if you always treat it as a chain on any rudiment or TR breakdown . . . For instance, I'd be . . if . . about the fifth time that a pc, or the third time a pc came into session with me and had a present time problem, I would ask this pc some sort of questioning like this.

You know, you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" And this is about the fifth time that this pc has had a fall on this rudiment. Every time the pc comes into session here lately it apparently has a PT problem. Well, now the PT problem is this: that the pc is having PT problems.

Now, there's several things that can be adjudicated. Theoretically and casewise, you could adjudicate a lot of things from this. And you could actually trace the type of problem. You could actually scout down his chain, you could scout down his terminal, you could scout down his goal, just by "What kind of present time problem do you have?" don't you see? I mean there's a lot of technical nonsense and foofaraw that you could go into like this. you could make this very significant.

We're not talking about that type of significance now. We're just talking about the fact that this is the fifth time I've noticed this pc have a PT problem. So I assume immediately that this pc has consistently been audited with PT problems in restimulation. Pretty good, huh? I just assume. Well, all right. This is the fifth time he's had one with me. How often has he had one with auditors? "Have you ever been audited," then I will say, "when you had a PT problem?" Doesn't make any sense to him, so I saay, "Well, have you ever been audited and you didn't think you ought to be having an auditing session?"

Boom! "Well, when was that? Good. When was that? Good. When was that? Good. When was that one? All right. Good. When was that one? Good. When was that one? Oh, oh, yes. That one. Yeah, that one. That one." There are only eight thousand times.

So the pc has gotten up to a point of actually being audited when he shouldn't be audited. And he gets present time problems. . . There's a curious mechanism I ought to talk to you about.

Do you know that you can make somebody think they have done something by punishing them? You know that mechanism? Well, you can make reverses on all mechanisms work. If there are any mental mechanisms, you can pull the effect of a pc's action on the pc and make him wonder if he hadn't caused. You got the idea?

Because it's truth, you know, that he is at such cause over these things that those causes usually exist. But supposing we took somebody and we shook him suddenly, surprised him half out of his wits, you see . . a schoolboy . . and said, "Well, we're giving you a note to your parents for not having been in school yesterday." And then would say, "No, no, don't answer back. No arguments on your part now. No." And don't give him any chance to as-is it, you see. And within a half an hour, he'll wonder where he was yesterday. You got the idea? The other one is so grooved . . the cause effect of the person is so grooved . . that when you do something to him, he thinks the cause existed. In other words, you can just give him the effect and the cause is apparent.

So you can override this asking for yesterday's PT problem to a point of where he's absolutely convinced, you see, that he must have been causing things in yesterday's session that he doesn't remember now, and it'll cause a mystery. You get the idea? So you have to kind of play it in between. You don't want this other phenomenon occurring too thoroughly. So be reasonable about it and don't overwhelm him. Don't do this in an overwhelming fashion. Do it in rather quiet fashion. Don't jump him too hard about this sort of thing.

For instance, "Oh, haw!" he says. Something like this.

And you say, "Well, didn't you think I got that acknowledgement?"

And he said, "No, I don't think you did."

And/or "Don't you think I got that origin?"

"No, I don't think you did."

And you say, "Well, now, what did you say again?" And he tells you, and you say, "Well, good."

And now if you leveled a long, bony finger at him and you said, "You realize that you have not originated once and had it arrive with me?" The wrong thing to do, you see. The pc actually would kind of have a sneaking notion that this was true. So you have to approach it with the other angle, and you say, "Now, as unlikely as it may seem, have you originated anything else that I mightn't have gotten?"

"Yes. Yes. Oh, no, no, no, no. Uh, yes. No."

He'll be just racing over these things one right after the other, and he'll finally pick one out. Now, you say, "Well, is there an earlier one than that?"

"Well."

And all of a sudden we will usually run into one that is nicely, deeply buried. And it's not now a mystery. You see, you can kind of insist too hard that one existed and get him to actually believe that one might have existed but then not be able to find it, you see. And he'd be left in the mystery that there probably was one there, but he couldn't find it, you know. So you mustn't be too forthright. You mustn't be too harsh. I don't mean forthright. Go ahead. Be forthright. But don't be harsh about existing, you see.

"Now, there certainly was one, you know. Yes, there was one. There was one yesterday. I know there must have been one because today, you see, you are ARC breaky. And there . . so there must have been one yesterday, and Ron says so," you see. And that kind of an attitude, and the guy says, "Was there one yesterday? Well, there probably wasn't one yesterday. I don't know whether there was one yesterday or not. Huhuhuhuhu! If he says so, it must be true," and so forth, "and therefore, there must have been one yesterday."

So it takes a rather clever attitude on the auditor's part. It takes a mild attitude. You have to play this thing in the middle of the path, you see. "Could there have been one yesterday?" You know, it's that type of approach which you want. "Could there have been an earlier one? Is there any possibility that this might have been the case, huh?"

"No. Oh, except, uh . . ." you see, and one will turn up. Get how you do this?

All right. Down go the cans. you say, "What's the matter?"

Pc says, "I shouldn't be here."

You handle that. "Why shouldn't you be here?" Handle it very briefly. And "Have you had an earlier feeling that you shouldn't have been here in this session?"

"That I shouldn't have been here. That's an odd thing. I always feel like that, you know."

And the pc starts tracing it back and he gets interested in this, and so forth, and may hit the first time he was ever audited. And just before the session, he said, "Well, maybe I shouldn't let somebody fool with my mind," or something like that. And always since that time his auditing has all been balling up on this one little early point. His distrust in auditors. This sort of thing will tend to come up one way or the other, and you have actually then handled the situation, and so your auditing will now be much faster.

So the answer to this didn't mean to go on like this at this length, but the answer to this question is, if a pc is doping off, you might be expecting too much of the pc, or you might be expecting the pc to answer or you might be expecting something or other to happen. But factually, the pc has had some impulse to leave session. So you better find it out, and you better trace it back. And look for a chain. Don't look for an incident until you get way, way back and you find out the first time Goals Assessment came up, that he was very leery of telling anybody any of his goals.

And you get back to what I was talking to you yesterday. There are lots of reasons why people don't want to give you goals because people just step on goals and, you know, all kinds of things, and people insist you have goals. So unless you clear up that sort of thing, you're bound and determined to have somebody boil off, out of session, long goals lists, you know. These various other manifestations all occur from the same thing: A pc . . a person has some feeling like he shouldn't be there. And of course, that's "out of sessionness." "Shouldn't be there" . . "out of sessionness." "Interested in own case, willing to talk to the auditor." That's your technical observation of the person being in session. So the person is in-session. He is interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor. The person is not in-session, then there's a feeling he shouldn't be there.

There isn't a feeling that he shouldn't be interested in own case and shouldn't talk to the auditor. You know, these are not two sides of a coin. On one side of the coin is "interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor." On the other side of the coin is this entirely different thing, which is "shouldn't be there." You get boil-off, dope-off, everything else. Something has happened to convince him he's in the wrong place. Only it might have been in earlier auditing sessions. It might have been with other auditors.

It might go way on back, don't you see. It's a good thing to run them down. I don't care how much time you spend straightening out somebody or orienting somebody on the subject of auditing because it's all gain.

So you've asked me a question here . . it's unsigned . . but you've asked me a question here, which had an answer which you probably didn't suspect which is that all boil-off and all dope-off is blood brother to "walk out the door, throw down the cans, ARC break with the auditor." It's all blood brother, and it's "shouldn't be here," which is the reverse side of the coin of "interested in own case, willing to talk to the auditor." Come to think about it, we've never defined "out of sessionness." And that is the definition of out of session. We define in-session, but define out of session and it might make your auditing much easier. The definition, of course, is "unwilling to be there." Simple as that.

Okay. Any other questions here today? Yes.

Male voice: Could you give us some hints about dealing with stuck and sticky needles in rudiments and elsewhere?

Dealing with stuck and sticky needles, rudiments and elsewhere.

Sticky needle means games condition. Person is in a state of denial, and so forth.

Needle stuck . . person's stuck on the track. Always in a condition of "should be there-shouldn't be there," if we want to carry on the same thing we were talking about before. Only stuck on the track is a "should be there - shouldn't be there," all in the same breath. Why is he keeping it mocked up if he shouldn't be there? But nevertheless he shouldn't be there and he's keeping it mocked up because he should be there.

You could drive somebody stark, staring mad, you know, if there were a real, honest-to-goodness, observable emergency going on, such as a building being bombed, and telling him he ought to be inside rescuing the people, at the same time convince him that he had better be outside to take care of them when they're brought out. Well, you could go worse than this, and you should tell him the safest place is inside as long as he stays outside. And a person would go kind of mad.

So a sticky needle is a sort of a "shouldn't be there-must be there" sort of a situation. And sticky needles are difficult to cure only to the degree that they betoken a certain amount of "out-of-sessionness." Just to that degree that the person is out of present time. It's not a very serious out of sessionness. It's just that the person is out of present time. He's listening to the arrows whistling on the walls of Acre, you see, and he should be listening to the auditor giving the next auditing command. And he gets distracted from what the auditor is doing and saying and to this degree . . which goes on continuously in cases. There isn't anything you can do about that, except audit them. That's why you're auditing them. So you get a situation where the fellow's needle is badly stuck. He for sure would recover more slowly than if he were fully in-session. Don't you get the idea? So the more time you spend effectively in getting this individual in-session, the faster a sticky needle will loosen. Interesting? Actually, your effort to get him in-session gets him out of where he's in on the track, you see. And it works very neatly.

I here s no worry about a sticky needle. So needles stick. So they loosen. It's when a needle is sticky and continues to be sticky and never loosens that you start worrying. You never get a change of setting, and so forth, because it means there isn't much case gain going on here. A not-know type of Goals Assessment, you see . . I mean a forgotten goals, goals that shouldn't be known . . . And if you ask somebody, "Do you have any goals that shouldn't be generally known?" Cow-cow-cow-cow. You get a brand-new response on the thing. A type of goal of "Where would you like to be?" following this thing out. "Have you ever had any goals of being places? Have you ever had any goals of not being places?" And you can loosen up somebody's needle wham! wham! wham! wham! wham! See? Just run, "to be there-not to be there" off as part and parcel of the Goals Assessment, and you'll get into some very interesting responses on a sticky needle.

Of course, if he's in a place he shouldn't be in then he doesn't have any havingness, is that right? And if he has no havingness, why then, of course, he's got a sticky needle and he's got lots of ridges, and so on.

If a person's needle was sticky on me . . if I had a person whose needle was consistently sticky on me in an auditing session and I didn't seem to be able to do too much about it . . I'm afraid I'd start plowing it to them on the subject of withholds, long duration present time problems, find those hidden standards and put them in the Security Check, and in doing a Goals Assessment, I would find "goals that had better not be known." You see, it's a whole class of goals that couldn't be accomplished if they were known. Do you realize that?

In the banking world . . what do you think about the banking world? Supposing everybody knew the various goals of various financiers with regard to the swap and exchange of currencies, contracts, negotiable securities between here and Switzerland? Game would blow up in no time.

I'll tell you a symptom of that, by the way, that you might find quite amusing. Did you know that twenty-four hours before there is a change in the bank rate that you cannot get a call through to Switzerland? And that the telephone company always knows when there's going to be a change in the bank rate and the Exchequer is going to make an announcement, because twenty-four hours before they can't have a line to Switzerland. It's all jammed. It's jammed totally, straight across. And they say, "Well, there's going to be a change in the bank rate. Somebody's pals have been let in on it," you know. "Here we go." Interesting, huh?

So here's a whole bunch of hidden goals, you see, that would be knowingly hidden goals, you know, which these very fellows would tell you, "Well, it's the most practical thing in the world," you know. "What do you mean? That isn't reprehensible in any way. We wouldn't make any money if these weren't hidden. The goal is to sell so many securities before the thing falls, and if we let it out that we were going to sell the securities before we sold the securities, cow! Well, of course, this would wreck the whole lot, and our goal would be ruined, so therefore we must be very secretive about this whole object and our objectives and so forth."

Well you, I imagine, find very many government-hired slaves . . I mean scientists. The slave brains they call them these days. I imagine those boys are very difficult to audit. It's not whether or not they've got withholds of secret materials. It's what goals are they withholding that the government has. you see, what goals of the government are they part and parcel of that must not be known. And you take such a case and it'll go bang, bang, bang, bang. you ask them "What goals shouldn't be known?" Oh, man, they are legion. Well, naturally, a pc not in that dramatic atmosphere is going to have a similar difficulty. Goals that shouldn't be known. And then goals not to be there and goals to be there. Yeah, what kind of goals are those? Let's shake them down. And you will find, I think, that needle start loosening up like mad, very rapidly.

They've had a goal to be in school. They've had a goal not to be in school. they'll usually be flip-flops, you see. They've had a goal to go to southern France, and they've had a goal to stay in England. And they've had a goal to live in a big house, and they've had a goal to continue to live in the house they're in. And they've had a goal not to live in a big house, and they've had a goal not to live in the house they're in. And you watch these things. And they'll just be on both sides of the card. It's a deck of playing cards with kings and queens and aces, and so forth, printed on both sides. You can't turn these cards over without finding the same card on the other side, you see.

You say, "Have you had a goal to do anything?" Well, yes, they've had a goal to do that, and they've also had the goal not to do that. And it is just repetitive. You say, "Have you ever had a goal to own a boat?" "Yes, I've had a goal to own a boat." And they have also had a goal not to own a boat. And they will almost invariably add gratuitously, the negative goal. It occurs to them immediately afterwards, you see. So your plus and minus goals and, of course, your plus and minus locations . . goals with regard to locations . . are particularly pregnant with susceptibility. And you could move that sticky needle.

Routine 3, as you might have suspected, is your beefiest process. It is the strongest of all these processes. And the only thing that gets in the road of Routine 3 is a person isn't enough in-session to be assessed. That's the only thing that gets in the road of that. We've been trying to solve that, one way or the other.

But that is a sort of a self-defeating mechanism because this other thing is true. This other thing is gruesomely true: that the pc is in a valence which is denying help and everything else to the pc, and to whom the pc is denying help. And the computation is if the pc gets well, the valence will be helped. And, of course, the pc is going to stay as sick as he can get to make the valence sick. you got the idea?

So anything that is not directed immediately to the goal and the valence connected with this situation, is to a marked degree lost time. The isolation of that terminal isolates the biggest games condition the pc has. And up to that time, you are to a marked degree only auditing a terminal alien to the pc's better being. You see that? Until that terminal is isolated, nothing much is going to happen.

Now, I know how to scare such terminals into view more rapidly. I know how to do faster Goals Assessments, but your first law on that would be progress, and progress is measured by the change of meter. And if you're not getting any change of meter as you do an assessment, you must assume there is something real weird going on here which inhibits this thing from changing and that there's something very wrong with being assessed for goals. Goals must be not-known. You must assume that there's a great deal of mystery of location and whereabouts and other things of this character on this case. And you'll just go to the root of these things because as I say it is self-defeating because these things only are useful to the degree that they advance a Goals Assessment for the location of the eventual terminal of the pc. you follow that?

So you do anything in your power to get a goals assessment running well and smoothly. And there's a couple of mechanisms . . I've already given you one of them, which is not-known goals; goals that are not known, goals that they've forgotten. "What goals have you forgotten?" "What goals shouldn't be known?" Any not-know . . postulates one and three in order of line. First not . . Native State, Not-Know, Know, Forget, Remember . . postulates one and three. You work those things over one way or the other on the subject of goals backwards and forwards; on the subject of terminals, backwards and forwards.

And let me give you the other one here which is, I just said, terminals. Not-known terminals. When you finally get up to a person's Terminal Assessment, and so on, you can run "unknown people," "not-known people." "Who would you care not to know?" Interesting question, isn't it?

You could probably use variations of that to do a different type of clearing. Which is to say, you theoretically could blow all the valences the case was mixed up with by running nothing but generalities on beingnesses and terminals, don't you see? But that's only theoretical. And it's never been done. And the other is successful, so we'll let the other one ride until it gets up into an area of good practice where we know where it is. "Who would you rather not know?" "What sort of being shouldn't be known by anyone?" "Is there any being on the track that you regret you knew?" This type of interrogation would, of course, shake up the valence in which the pc was locked up. So remember there's that type of approach, completely aside from this assessment type of approach. Two different ways to go about the same breed of cat.

What you're trying to do is get the person's valence out into view because the person is at war with this valence, and this valence is the solution to a problem that the pc has never been able to confront. Right?

So anyway, any which, any way you work it out, you'll win as long as you can get the pc to sit still. The best way to keep a pc sitting still is to pick up all of his ARC breaks and so forth, and don't keep courting disaster on the thing. Anytime, by the way, you have a tumultuous pc, don't keep blaming it on the pc because it's ARC breaks, rudiments out earlier than the time they're occurring.

If you wanted to really set a pc up for auditing . . . Let's say you were in San Diego and the pc came walking in, and they'd been audited by this one or that one down through the years, and so on, and they came in and the case didn't appear to be in very bad shape, and everything was going along fine. And you actually wanted to do the best possible thing for this pc. It would be to cover rudiments of all sessions the

pc has ever had, including the time period before they decided to have their first session. Just . . in other words, just set it up and go about it arduously on down the line.

Now, what gets in the road is the pc isn't going to sit still for all this. They're going to consider it a waste of time. It is a slow freight. There's all sorts of arguments of it. And your own impatience and anxiety to get the show on the road doesn't get you to set the case up so that it can be audited, and so mistakes can be made. And you very often . . in the largest majority of cases you get away with it. So you can keep on doing it. But if you were just arduously to take the case and set it up on every rudiment for every session and every auditor and every session they have given . . "Have you ever given a session while you had a present time problem?" You know? You get the idea? "When was that?" you know.

And just take all the rudiments and set them all up on the subject of auditing from the first instance, and spend fifty hours at it, clearing would be a hundred hours earlier. You see what I mean? You could speed it up by apparently taking a lot of time.

And anybody who was making no gain or no progress, who had had auditing before, I would suspect there was something wrong with the auditing, and try to trace all this back and find out if there wasn't a hangfire or a flailed help or find something else. you know, just look over this auditing. Let's set up this case. Let's look over the whole zone and area, and don't keep auditing at one little target when you've got all of life for a target as far as this pc is concerned.

Of course, we know the fast way to get about it. The fast way to do it is set the pc up so the pc will stay in-session so that you can do a good assessment on the pc for goals, get the goals . . find the one goal that hangs up or, lucky you would be, no goal hangs up; they just go Clear. You see, that's possible too, you know. If they just went Clear on goals, you've had it. you never get a chance to do a Terminal Assessment.

But get the goal and then get terminals for that particular goal, and then give it some runs and flatten that, and do another assessment. Let's check over that goal and find out if it's flat. Maybe get another terminal for the same goal, or get a new goal. And they just keep on running, and they will go Clear. That's it. That is the way to clear them. There is no other known operation at this time, which auditors can and will do to clear people. Chat one will. But setting a person up for that and straightening them out and making them handle a great many things, getting all kinds of things out of the road in order to set a person up for the assessment, of course, is of interest, too. But the pc isn't much interested in it, and that's what gets in your road.

The pc is sort of hauled away from his central goal of getting a Goals Assessment done. You've all had that happen to you already. You'd much rather be assessed for goals. Much rather find your goal, not necessarily be assessed for goals. Would much rather find your goal and find your terminal and that's it. And any preliminary step to that finds you very impatient. "Oh, no. you haven't got a fall on a present time problem again? Oh, good heavens. That means you're going to burn up here a half an hour or so handling this present. . . oh, for heaven's sakes," you know. The guy's got a present time problem right now in having to handle a present time problem, don't you see.

Good way to handle it, however, if the pc will sit still, is let's just trace all the times they were audited while they had present time problems. A present present time problem will probably blow up. Did they ever have this particular type of present time problem before is the best entrance point for that kind of a search. Well, that's an interesting question.

The fellow says, "Well, I have a terrible present time problem. I've just received a letter from my solicitor, and I have to come up with eight billion pounds or drachma or something by two o'clock yesterday, you know." An interesting way to handle it has probably never been mentioned to you before, but an interesting way to handle it is say:

"Well, have you ever had this type of problem before?"

"Oh, well, now that you mention it. Come to think about it, I never have any other type of problem."

"Oh, is that so?" And it goes insensitive as far as the session is concerned. Cognition of this as a continuous state of being. All of a sudden, 'Well, let's get down to this, see. Why? Why do I always have this kind of a present time . . . Why me?" you know. "How come?" You see. And the immediate existence of that specific present time problem has now broadened out, and you've actually cut the props from underneath the present time problem. And even though it took you a half an hour or forty-five minutes or an hour to bring about that cognition, you are not then going to have to handle present time problems afterwards to amount to anything. When they come up, you just refer to the same modus operandi. They know that worked earlier. They rip it all up again, and there goes the present time problem, see? You can get around it that way.

ARC break. "Do you have an ARC break with me?"

"Oh, yes."

"All right. Is this the same type of ARC break? You had this same type of ARC break before?" Brrrrrroot, see. Rip them up. Otherwise, you're just going to keep getting ARC breaks, see. ARC breaks, add to the chain. ARC breaks, add to the chain. ARC breaks, add to the chain. You get the idea? So you're going to handle a late engram. You're going to be running late engrams all the time, huh? Hey! You can't erase them. So your pc, of course, is making no progress in assessment.

There is no substitute for setting a pc up to be audited. No substitute for it. There is no fast road for it either beyond some of the tips I could give you about the fact that ARC breaks go in chains. PT problems go in chains. The difficulties with auditing rooms go in chains. And you can handle them as a chain. And then you are saving time. And you are doing a better job of it. Any rudiment can be handled as a chain. And if you handle it expertly as a chain, particularly if you find basic-basic on that chain, the whole chain will tear up.

See, ARC breaks are basically resting on overts. And if ARC breaks are resting on overts, then an unkind thought regarding Book One Scientology may very well be something that sat at the basis of the chain. The person hadn't even read it, see, had never even seen it.

We had a case that was always getting ARC breaky in sessions, and so forth, and they actually traced back on the basic-basic of the thing of having made an unkind remark to his father about . . . Well, they picked it up. They read a chapter too carelessly. They gave each other a five-minute auditing session, and then they agreed it didn't work. And you know that postulate hung fire with that same person for about seven years? It wasn't picked up until about 58. And all of a sudden the case just started to make very good gains in processing, and so forth. But up until that time, I was having a hell of a time with it because they ARC broke all the time in sessions. See they had an overt against the thing that was now supposed to help them. Interesting.

So handle your rudiments in chains and you'll get along a lot faster. Handle all of these things. And if the case is hanging up, why, suspect that there's a great deal of not-know about it. It's just as . . if it would take you a long time to clear up a rudiment, suspect that there is a not-know about this rudiment. The basic not-know about a rudiment is that it happened before. And the ARC break that exists is not the ARC break you are trying to handle but an earlier ARC break. You see, that's a not-know. So there's a not-know hanging back there on the chain. The chain won't therefore pull up and the later incident won't erase. So the pc remains slightly out of session even though you have handled the (quote) (unquote) "the ARC break."

And then with the generality of a case not making progress under a Goals Assessment or not giving their goals properly, again, assume that a not-knowingness exists someplace m that zone. you don't know what the pc's responses to goals is. you don't know what the pc's response is and you keep asking him for goals, well, what's his response based on? Does he say to himself privately, "Oh, for Christ's sakes," each time before he gives you a goal? Does he? See. You wouldn't be making progress, but you wouldn't know what it was. And the thing would not be running and it would be hidden.

So you say, "Well, do you have another goal? Or did you have another childhood goal?"

And he says to himself privately, "Oh, for Christ's sakes." And he says aloud to you, "Well, to be a railroad engineer," you see.

Well, how far do you think this number of overts can continue without suddenly blowing up one into a storm or at least stalling the case just to a dead stop. So any time you're not making progress with a case for any reason at all . . this is just auditing in general . . assume the case is out of session. Definition of out of session is "don't want to be there." Why not? Must have overts if they're trying to leave. All these various other laws apply, don't you see. So trace them down.

And when you're handling rudiments and you keep finding rudiments out, find the chain. And if the pc is getting upset in a session or restive or something of that sort, assume that something happened much earlier, and find it and blow it. And all of a sudden your auditing will become a very, very smooth activity. Won't have many bumps to it. Be a delight. You're in for a surprise before I end this off. You're in for a surprise.

If a pc has a number of ARC breaks scattered up and down the auditing chain . . of sessions, you see . . and ARC breaks unhandled exist broadly on this chain, then you're going to find out that a pc, in the session you are running, is getting an ARC break about every third auditing command. You're just going to be staggered at the number of actual ARC breaks that you can find on this pc in the session you are running, you see? That's something you want to notice on a pc that's getting lots of ARC breaks. So pick them all up. Pick them all up, all the way back. Take up the whole history of auditing on this pc if it's getting that rampant.

But you're going to be utterly amazed. You're going to find out the more ARC breaks there have been on the auditing track, the more ARC breaks occur on the auditing track. It's sort of like the more you eat, the more you got, you know. And it's unreasonable but factual.

The more PT problems you find on a pc, the more PT problems have existed on this pc, and if this pc is also an auditor, you're also going to run into the auditing chain of auditing while having a PT problem. You know, got an appointment at three o'clock and the pc is now getting at a quarter of three, and. . . That last fifteen minutes is audited with a PT problem. Well it's not very destructive and it doesn't do very much, but these things will come off as you run the thing. Okay?

Well, I'll probably give you a lecture tomorrow.

Female voice: Good.

Okay?

Audience: Thank you.

As far as your Goals Assessment is concerned, I hope you're having a little better luck. Did goals assessing speed up on you using some of this material or didn't it? Hm? Or is it going the same speed as before?

Female voice: Well, as a pc it certainly speeded up.

Hm?

Female's voice: As a pc it certainly speeded up for me.

Hm. Have you noticed any difference as an auditor using "not-know" on goals? Have you?

Female voice: Mm-hm.

All right. But not too much difference. Now, you notice this then . . notice this then . . how fast it speeds up if you really handle these out-rudiments in chains. Then you just find out how rapidly this thing goes.

And the only other hint I would give you is don't be so anxious to erase them. Just establish whether or not they're going to stay or going to go. And if they're going to go, throw them away, you know. Just run them down if they're going to go. you can tell. And if they're going to stay, why, find out in about three questions. You say, "That's still alive." Ask three times. It's gone. Don't expect the pc to say a thing back. Don't expect the pc to contribute one blasted thing to the actual rundown and erasure of goals. The pc can sit there like a stump on the log, and the E-Meter will still react. The pc doesn't have to say aye, yes or no or spit. Nothing, and it'll still react. It's very amazing. The pc doesn't even have to have his (quote) attention (unquote) on the goal you just read to have it react if it's still alive. Did you know that? Quite amazing, isn't it?

And don't be so anxious to rub them out, you know. Leave them there for a while. Let him have them for a little while, you know. You'll find they disappear faster because you're not spending so much time on one goal. It's actually a faster way to get rid of goals. Okay?

All right. Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

Thank you.