**ROUTINE 3A**

A lecture given on
7 November 1961

Thank you. Well, you're lucky people. You're lucky. You are. You don't know it but you are.

What have you done in the last two hundred trillion years to make you this lucky? Hm? Now, what have you done?

Female voice: Got smart enough to come here.

Aha. Got smart enough to come here. All right.

Now, your immediate, direct business today which is the . . what is this? The 7th of. . .

Female voice: 7th of November.

November, AD 11. All right. Your immediate, direct business today is Routine 3A and the talk I'm going to give you is totally concerned with Routine 3A and you should have in your possession HCO Bulletin of November 7th, 1961. This is one of those rare occasions where the lecture, the bulletin, the data and the cases are all assembled at one point of conjunction.

Now, may I call your attention to a safety table which I think was the 26 October . . hm?

Female voice: 29th of October.

29th of October. The safety table . . what it is safe to process. Well, it is safe to process a goals terminal. It's quite safe to process one. But it's not safe to process any other than a goals terminal. Therefore, the only people who should run Routine 3A are, of course, those people who have been trained, and the only terminals that should be run are those that have been checked out by a graduate of Saint Hill, period.

That puts a sort of a limiter on the amount of auditing done until you realize that I have simply said checked out. Checked out. That takes those zones and areas of the world that are too lazy to send anybody to Saint Hill or something of the sort and that leaves them unclear, but they can go ahead and beef up their banks and have a ball.

But we're not going to worry about them. Our next concern after this is after all of the bad assessments have been done and all of the bad runs have been done and everything is all messed up, how to salvage a case that has been put into that condition by auditing which is unauthorized.

And I call to attention a Class II at this moment is the only authorized auditing anyplace in the world where a Saint Hill graduate is not. That means all the field. That means all organizations, and so forth. That means Class II, which consists of Security Checking, problems, getting rudiments in. There's tremendous numbers of things that can be done under Classes I and II, and we've been doing them for years and getting good wins on them. So why everybody has to stretch up against a Class III activity is a little more than I can comprehend. Because when you get up to this level of Class III, if you don't know your business you can really tear somebody to shreds.

Now, hitherto we have been running Routine 3, and this is one of those milestones in a line of research and we cease as of now to run Routine 3. It has ceased and desisted. We will never again run Routine 3. It is ended because it is modified.

And the modification of Routine 3 is extremely simple and all it consists of is simply adding a step to Routine 3. There is just a step added in.

Now, in Routine 3 we found a goal. And we did this by getting the pc to do a list or we wrote down the list the pc gave us. And we didn't do it, by the way, by taking the pc's list and then filing it and saying, "Well, of course, the pc doesn't know what's wrong with him so his goal can't be on this list, and so we put this away in the files. Now we get another list and we ask him if he has any more goals. And we can't find any more of those goals. So we try to find were the rudiments out. And then, of course, the rudiments are out. Nobody can get the rudiments in. And so . . and you don't have to look at an E-Meter either because it doesn't know either." And then decide that the person has lots of marital difficulties so that their terminal must be, of course, a husband.

That is not the way we do . . did . . should do such a thing. What we do is get a goals list. It's all too elementary. I get at this point and I go into a little bit of confusion about this point, because I never can quite guess what people are going to add to something They can always add something like, well, what I just said, you know: "The pc never knows what's wrong with him, so therefore his goal that he gives you couldn't be right, and you have to make up a goal for the pc." Don't think it hasn't been done. I mean, that's how they miss Goals Assessments. Terrific invalidation and all that sort of thing.

But we learned in Routine 3 that it was very difficult to get a goal. We learned that you had to get a goal with the rudiments in, in, in. And we had to be very careful of this, and we had to not invalidate the pc, and we had to be very, very sharp in getting our goal. And nothing of that is altered in Routine 3A.

In fact, it might now become just a little bit more difficult. Because we have found another piece of the puzzle.

Now, having found the goal . . having found the goal, by doing an assessment as in steps 1, 2 and 3 of Routine 3 . . A, also . . same thing. We got it checked out of course by somebody else. We made sure that this was the right goal. And then we asked the pc, in Routine 3, what terminals would answer up to that goal, and we had cause and effect type terminals. And we made lists of these. And then we assessed this by elimination, and we finally came up with one terminal . . only one terminal sounding Just as we had only one goal remaining in, then we came up with one terminal remaining in. And that thing stayed in and was not sporadic or fluctuating It always gave instant reads. That was the pc's terminal.

And then we assessed this on the Prehav &ale and having assessed it, we put together a . . found the level of the Prehav &ale and we put that into a five-way bracket. And having put it into a five-way bracket, we then ran the pc on this. Along with this, we, of course, did Security Checking That's Routine 3.

Now, if you've learned Routine 3, it is absolutely nothing to do Routine 3A. There's a wild difference between these two Routines, but not in the way to do them.

Now, we come to this problem with Routine 3. Difficulty of assessment. Skip it. That is merely a matter of auditing skill. You can assess or you can't assess. You can audit or you can't audit. I mean, that's all there is to that.

Given assessment and then assessment of terminal and then run on the Prehav Scale, we had only a small percentage of the people running in this particular fashion going Clear rapidly. Why? Why? What was this . . rest of this percentage? And this has been my action and activity through April, May, June, July, August, September, October of 1961. Why?

They all would . . apparently running on the right terminal. They all obeyed the rules of terminals and so on. So we went off into hidden standards and we investigated that very thoroughly.

And we did a lot of good for cases, and we found a whole new chapter in processing. And we found out that you get the prior confusion and blow off the stuck circuit, and you could do a lot of tricky things with this hidden standard. We learned how to take problems apart this way.

And actually right now all you have to do is just find the prior confusion to an out-rudiment, and the rudiment will go in. I mean, this was a big gain. So it's easier now to get rudiments in. If we just did them by prior confusion, we would get our rudiments in. These were wins and cases ran a bit better. We had the idea of group mores and that the individual was breaking down a third dynamic mores, and all of

a sudden we have moved Clear from the status of first dynamic Clear through second dynamic Clear to third dynamic Clear. We've gotten that far.

In other words, we're cleaning up the first, second and third dynamic. Clears made prior to this date are beautifully cleaned up on the first. And just between ourselves, they sometimes act like it. So without graduating somebody up through a first dynamic Clear, we can at this particular stage of the game . . . That's no crack on the thing, but I have actually had some backlashes in this direction that were very first dynamicy. They're very reasonable, but very first dynamicy which was no objection on my part. I never rolled them under because of it, but that was the way it was.

And we have here . . we're looking at a third dynamic Clear, particularly in Routine 3A because we're going to run it in this particular direction. We keep broadening this concept of Clear and we keep broadening the stability and the expected stability of Clear and we keep shortening the number of hours to Clear.- And shortening down the hours to Clear has been my main action, but it also has "Let's just knock out all of this slow gain." And I have been fighting on that research front here all during this summer, working with students and so forth. Not experimentally . . we were always doing exactly . . where we were going and what we were doing, and most that we knew. But all of a sudden, there was a violent blue spark, and it went from one corner of the Saint Hill to the other corner of the Saint Hill, and it left ozone behind it all the way. In short, I had a cognition of some magnitude. What on earth keeps a goal hanging? Why does a goal . . why is a goal alive at all? I mean, how has this goal come down the track endlessly, endlessly, endlessly, endlessly, eons and eons and eons. What is keeping this goal there?

Well, we know of only one mechanism that does this. Only one mechanism does this, and that is the mechanism of a problem. Problem definition: postulate-counter-postulate. And because they're postulate-counter-postulate, the thing gets suspended in time. In other words, you have a postulate, and that postulate would just evaporate unless it had resistance.

And there are two postulates counter-opposed, and each one of them are of equal force, so if these two postulates are of equal force, you get something hung up in time.

The way you can unsettle this postulate-counter-postulate, of course, is very easily, as we have recently discovered, just find the area of prior confusion. And of course, it weakens or strengthens one or the other of the two postulates as you get the overts and the withholds off, and the thing tips over, and the problem disappears.

But let's look at the difficulty of keeping a problem alive . . the great difficulty of it. It has to be two balanced forces. Otherwise, one force overbalances the other force and ceases to be a problem, becomes a solution or ceases to exist.

We have a husband and a wife, and they have fought, and they have fought, and they have fought. And finally one of them gives up. They don't fight anymore. Maybe they aren't . . maybe one of them isn't happy, maybe the other one isn't happy; but that's beside the point. They aren't a problem any more. They're a solved situation. It's a solved area. Or they get divorced and separate, and they aren't a problem any more there either until an auditor comes along to it and tries to settle why they're having difficulty in their current marriage. And he finds this past marriage still hanging fire someplace in the bank.

But the problem has to have two more or less . . two or more, more or less balanced, forces counter-opposed. You have a bull weighing twenty-seven hundred pounds with his forehead pushed up against a bull weighing twenty-seven hundred pounds. And these two bulls are pushing with twenty-seven hundred foot-pounds of thrust. And they're trying to collapse their heads into each other to the depth of one foot, in other words, but there they are.

And if you consider them from the standpoint of a problem, there they would be. There's nothing going to happen because one twenty-seven hundred pound bull is pushing against one twenty-seven hundred pound bull. And unless somebody makes their foreheads skid or trips one bull or something like that, there they are going to stand in the pasture. Now, that is a problem. And that is the problem. And that is the anatomy of a problem.

When the pc says to you, "I have a present time problem," and you get a fall on your meter and so forth, this is the kind of thing that's happening The pc's effort to go in some direction is being countered by an effort of him not to go in the direction or somebody else's effort to go in a different direction. And these two forces are counter-opposed. And you get an nonresolved situation. It's nonresolved. It is not nonresolvable as some pcs would have you believe. It just doesn't happen to be resolved because it's in counterpoise. And that's what happens there.

Now, you run off, of course, the pc's end of this, and it then will cease to be, very often, a problem with the other party. Now, why does it cease to be a problem with the other party?

Well, it takes two twenty-seven hundred pound bulls. And you've just taken one twenty-seven hundred pound bull and you have either made him go up to three thousand pounds, you see, or you have headed him in an opposite direction with regard to this sort of thing. And of course you don't have postulate-counter-postulate now. You have something else.

And the other person who has the other side of the problem in present time, of course has nothing to push against, and so that postulate evaporates.

You see why this mechanism exists. This happens very often. I mean, all too often for just happenstance.

We process a pc on her family. And we process her on her family, and we spend hours at it and so on. And we finally finish up, and she seems all cleaned up on the family. She's not worried about her family now. She doesn't . . not trying to make her family guilty, or not not make her family guilty. And there she is, and she suddenly receives a letter, a telephone call or something. And it says, "Dear Amy, All is forgiven. Come home." Or something like this will occur, you know. It's quite amazing.

One particular instance, there was somebody worried about money disappearing out of the cash box in an organization. Money disappearing out of the cash box. Money disappearing out of the cash box. This person was worried about it. Blaming herself. Blaming herself. Blaming herself for money disappearing out of the cash box. Couldn't figure out how the money was disappearing out of the cash box. Thought she must be guilty about it. Worried, worried, worried, worried, worried. Got it run in an auditing session.

The second that she had it run in the auditing session, almost within the hour following it, the person who had been taking the money out of the cash box came in, paid the money back. Mysterious, wasn't it. Well, apparently, the person worrying about it all the time, and force and so forth, had this interlocked in some peculiar way in the theta universe in some fashion where nothing resolved. Nothing was happening. Now, there we're getting a little esoteric. Do you see? That's a little bit out beyond the understandable boundary.

But we have this, of course, as the most obvious thing: There's the husband, and he goes home. And he has an awful fight with the wife, and they chop each other up. And then the husband gets audited. And then all of a sudden, why, he's nicer to the wife, or she hasn't got anything to push against. Or she's baffled, she has a new problem maybe . . "Who is this?" You know? Something on that order. And of course, the problem has ceased to exist by very material understanding I mean, we can understand how that problem would cease to exist. We've changed one of the protagonists.

But how about this other one? Five thousand miles away the girl's family haven't written to her for years. We process her on her family and all of a sudden the family goes into communication with her. This happens all too often.

But these are all examples of things suspended in time. As long as you've got two interlocked forces, you get a time suspension. And when you're dealing with the mind. . . This is not necessarily true in the physical universe. These two bulls actually are moving on the time track. But in straight thinkingness, there is no apparent motion on the time track where two things are interlocked.

You've got postulate-counter-postulate, and it's all mental, so it's not really tied down to the physical universe anyway. And it just goes on drifting in time. Well, an examination of this demonstrates that there

must be something on the other side of the goal. If this person has had a goal for the last eighteen trillennia, what has kept it there? You see? That's just the . . how come? How come it doesn't as-is? How come he never realizes it? How come he never backs off of it? How come he never quits on the subject? How come he never wins on the subject. It just stays there. He's got a goal "to pick gooseberries" or something And there it is.

And if you'd put him on a meter six trillennia ago, I'm sure that you would have gotten some kind of a reading "to pick gooseberries," you see. Well, how come it stayed there that long?

Well, it's the same anatomy as the problem. There is on the other side of every goal a thing called a modifier. The exact definition of a modifier you have in this bulletin: "A modifier is that consideration which opposes the attainment of a goal and tends to suspend it in time." That is a modifier.

Just as you have the husband fighting with the wife and the wife fighting with the husband, and their equal velocities of fighting, then, suspend that fight in time, in the same way, let us think of the husband as having a goal and the wife as the reasons why he isn't going to make one. And you get their counterpoise, then, carrying forward the whole thing as a problem, don't you see.

All right. Or let us say the wife has a goal and the husband is damned if she's going to realize it and so in similar circumstances you've got this whole thing carrying forward in time. In other words, you've got these two people locked horns to horns and they're not moving. Well, a person's goal found by a common Goals Assessment . . you don't do anything different in a Goals Assessment. You do it the same way you have always done. When you get the list of goals and so forth.

The next step to that is to find out how come it is locked in space. And you find out how it is locked in space by finding the modifier. Modifier is a technical term. I invite you to use it as such. You could call it lots of other things, but we don't happen to have called anything a modifier, so it doesn't mess up our . . it doesn't mess up our nomenclature. But it certainly does modify the goal. And that's what it sounds like when you get one. The thing it sounds most like is modifier.

Now, in doing Routine 3A, after getting your goal proved out and totally checked out on the person, you would then do a list of modifiers. This list, I think you will commonly find, is very short and I think the modifier is very easy to attain. But the reason the modifier does not come about is by the pure mechanics of its not-as-isness. It has a characteristic of not as-ising. It's a denyer.

If you know your old Dianetics, all pcs have denyers. And they'll go running along through an engram, yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yoppety-yoppetyyoppety-yop, and then skip. And they obviously . . there's something else went on there. And then they go on to the end of the engram, yoppety-yoppetyyoppety-yoppety-yop .

And when you finally find this middle of the engram, it'll be something like, "It isn't here." You know, somebody has said at that point, "It isn't here." Or somebody has said, "Well, nothing is happening just now." And the pc runs down the engram, hits this "Nothing is happening just now," never notices it because, of course, nothing is happening just now.

In other words, they take it literally, dramatize it, and it becomes truth, you see? So if there's nothing there, why, of course, the pc never runs that part of the engram. And after you've run it and run it and run it and run it and run it, a clever auditor in the old days would eventually ask for the bouncer which made him get out of it or the comeback, the pullback, or something like that. He'd ask for one of these types of phrases. And amongst those that he asked for was a denyer. Something that says it isn't here. Something that says it doesn't exist.

And he'd ask, "Is there a denyer there?"

And the pc would say, "No, there's nothing here."

And the clever auditor would say, "Repeat that."

And the pc would say, “All right. There’s nothing here. There’s nothing

here. There’s nothing . . well, what do you know? That’s my mother talking. She is saying, ‘There is nothing here.”’

Similarly, I have . . you can get phrases and that sort of thing, and meanings and senses, doing all kinds of queer things.

I ran into a case one time that had sonic only on one section of the track for one instant. And he always had sonic at that point of the track. And you run him along through engrams and so forth,- and he had no sonic, but he’d get into this one particular incident which he just couldn’t seem to run, by the way. And he kept it around; it was a good showpiece. And run it down, and just before the sonic turned on, we finally found out, it says, “Get away. Listen.”

And the pc, of course, listened, and he heard for the next few words. He’d hear pure sonic for the next few words. He’d hit this bouncer, and then he’d hit the listen command, and then he’d have sonic for a few words, and then the sonic would disappear.

People can become totally obedient to this type of phraseology. An old-time Dianetic auditor knows this very well. There’s nothing . . not much mysterious about this, but people who have . . later on the line, have never had too much experience with this particular type of phraseology and so forth. So when I tell you that all modifiers found so far were denyers at the same time, you’ll realize why the pc’s intelligence doesn’t go on over into them. They’re all a “It isn’t here.” See, they’re all a “Doesn’t exist.”

“But you couldn’t have any money anyway,” you see? “But you couldn’t” . . that is one. “But you couldn’t have any money anyway; they would take it all away from you.”

Well, of course, the pc states the goal. And then there’s the rest of this thing over here. If it occurred in an engram, that would be the way it is. Occurring as a goal, he runs along and he says, “Well, the goal is to rob banks.”

And you say, “That’s fine.” You assess it. You go find a terminal for it and everything else. Well, “To rob banks,” but there’s a little more to the goal, and it’s a denyer.

“But you couldn’t have any money, and they would take it all away anyway.” See, so that end of the goal disappears. That’s a disappeared end of the goal. Now, actually it doesn’t take any real skill to get these modifiers once you’ve got the goal. The skill is to get the goal. The goal is what is important here.

But as you get to step 4, you ask the person to make a list of modifiers. Maybe there’ll only be ten of them. Maybe there’ll only be one. Maybe they’ll come up with the first one, bang! And so on. But they get maybe eight, ten of these modifiers.

They’ve got a goal: “To play a violin.” And you find that all assessed out. It proved out just the way you’ve been doing it. Now, when you come to step 4 here, you say, “All right. Now, what would make that goal difficult to achieve? What would be the consequences of achieving it? What would make it impossible to realize that goal?” And write down anything the pc says and make a list of these. And that list . . you don’t write down “To play a violin and . . “ so forth. You just write down “and” and the remaining tail, you see. Just write down the tail. Don’t keep chugging the goal down his throat because you’ll never be able to assess the modifier if the goal is in as part of it.

You’ve got to assess the modifier . . the tail of the cat has got to be assessed all by itself. You keep saying the goal each time, and of course you’re going to get . . the thing will stay alive and you’ll never find the modifier because the goal, of course, and the modifier react alike. You’ve got to assess the modifier as itself.

“To play a violin.” And you’ve got that now. You’ve got it all proved out. Everything is fine. Now, you’re going to come back to step 4, and you’re going to ask him, “Well, what makes it difficult to do

that? What would make it impossible to do that? What would be the consequences of playing a violin, and so forth?"

And every time he says something that this would be, you write it down on this list. And of course the pc actually is much more likely, if you've got the actual goal, to give it to you. Just bang! you see. And it's just a matter of whether or not it's an "of" or an "as" or just some little wording change.

So you write it down every way that the pc tells you, and you've got this list of tails of the cat and their modifiers. And now you turn around and assess those, and you assess those by elimination just exactly as you assessed the goal. But don't call the goal off every time while you're eliminating them. Because, of course, none of them will ever eliminate if you keep calling the goal. You just want the tail.

All right. And you finally find out "to play a violin, but all the strings are missing." You know, the pc's intelligence never gets on to that type of a phraseology because it's missing. There's no way you can get to it, the pc will tell you. You're liable to get into arguments with the pc, but he says, "But there isn't any more of it. There isn't any more to the goal, you see."

And then eventually he'll say, "Well, it . . well, it does seem there's something missing here. Oh, I see what it is. Oh, well, yeah. Well, it's 'to play a violin but all the strings are missing"'

Well, that's the modifier: "All the strings are missing." And you write down "All the strings are missing." And then you say, "Well, is any other thing that'd modify and keep you from doing this?"

"Well, 'the instrument is gone.' That might be it. The strings are gone. Or 'to play a violin that doesn't have any strings on it."'

All right. You write down "doesn't have any strings on it." You see, you write down any way he phrases this thing. All right. You get a dozen of these things or whatever it is.

You ask him if there are any more modifications than he has given you. You get no knock on the meter. You get no knock on the thing You've got the modifier list.

Now, you simply go down this modifier list, one, two, three, four, five, six. Just do it by elimination. Just read them off to the pc the same way you assess goals, and you'll find that one is left alive, and that is it.

Now, having done that, you combine the goal and modifier. And you write that down. You combine the goal and modifier. That's step 6 here. And you combine the goal and modifier as the question for the terminal, but it's "to play a violin but all the strings are missing." And that was what proved out.

Now, you want to know "Who or what would play a violin with all the strings missing?" Now, this is very tricky stuff you've got with this sort of thing. Because it gives you a different Terminals Assessment than a plain Routine 3 Assessment. It gives you a realer, completely real, terminal to the pc which scoops up, if you've done it right, all of his hidden standards at the same time. That's what I've been gunning for.

Now, it is true that the terminal the pc has been running . . which was "to play a violin," and you have assessed out "virtuoso," and "virtuoso" did prove out. There's no doubt about it. And you've been running "virtuoso."

And "virtuoso" has been running, and it runs hard, and the pc goes vague on it, and there's sort of circuitry stays in, but the pc goes through it, and you're winning, and so forth. Well, there are many explanations for this, and I don't particularly care to be nailed down on the exact explanation, but I would say that you had, offhand, a more general terminal, or you had a terminal too early on the track to as-is easily, or something of this sort. You've got something else: it is on the goals terminal line, there's no doubt about that!

But you probably have the original form, or you've got something there. And the earlier you go on the track . . you might know this rule . . the earlier you go on the track, the tougher the energy masses are, so you get a rougher run. And you've been running "virtuoso" very nicely, but "to play a violin with all the strings gone" . . . And of course you assess, "Who or what would play a violin with all the strings gone?" and of course we get something of the order of "a circus clown."

And then you assess it, "circus," "clowns," "clown," well, it's "a clown." And you've got it. It's "a clown." Well, maybe it's a very decayed form of the terminal you were running originally, but it runs like a bomb because it's very close to the pc's reality, and it's very close to his circuits. So it runs more easily. And you'll find out it integrates more easily to the pc.

I'm not trying to tell you that Routine 3 terminals are wrong. If they are, hang me but it doesn't matter. All I'm trying to tell you is that they are apparently very resistive. They are quite hard to run and the pc bucks into them and he goes through big energy masses. And most of this to me is the symptom of trying to run too damn early on the track. Trying to run into the whole problem all at once.

Because look, if he had this goal for a while, and the goal was actually a pure goal, you, of course, would get a different kind of a terminal for the pure goal than the goal modified, you see. Now, you've got a different kind of a terminal. You may have a kind of a degraded type of terminal. You may have a different terminal anyway. It'll make different sense to the pc. And it actually assesses faster, and you will get a faster Terminals Assessment with it.

So you take the goal modifier . . you say, "All right. Who or what would play a violin with the strings gone?"

Well, obviously, you could have got hundreds and hundreds of terminals for "Who would play a violin?" but you don't get too many for "Who would play a violin with all the strings gone?" "An idiot. Uh . . a clown. Uh . . a party cutup. Um . . a fake." You see, a few things like that because it's so restricted. And you get a much shorter list. And it assesses rather easily.

So now you make up your terminals list combining the goal and modifier as the question "Who or what would (goal plus modifier)?" "Who or what would play a violin with strings gone?" And you make a nice list of these, and then . . just exactly the way you've handled any other Terminals Assessment . . you do this one now by elimination, and you'll wind up at the other end with a terminal, which is the only terminal in the lot that would react on the meter.

Now, you, of course . . there are several things you could do. Now, we get in, because we accumulated more technology, we were doing it the hard way, we accumulated a lot of technology to do it the hard way, you could do several things. You could address it to groups with this group type of command. You could address it to . . you could simply date it on the time track and find a prior confusion to it and do a Sec Check on it, and you'd probably blow the whole goal terminal mess.

You know, "When's the first time you ever ran into a clown?"

"Oh, well, that's different. The first time I ever ran into a clown . . yeah, who was trying to play a violin with all the strings gone. Oh, oh, oh, well, you mean that type of clown. Well, all right. Let's see. That particular type of clown, well. . ."

And you could probably date the thing and you could find an earlier area of confusion and so forth. You see, a door opens there. You get easier processes. Or you could run the terminal on a Sec Check sort of business, or fool around with that. Or you could find out how you wouldn't make the terminal guilty and how the terminal wouldn't dare make you guilty, a negative-guilt run. I can just think of dozens of ways to handle this exact situation. Why? Because it handles exactly as a present time problem handles.

You're now getting rid of goals and terminals with the modifier in there . . you're getting rid of them on the same basis that you would get rid of a present time problem. So how many ways are there to handle present time problems. Well, it'd be that many ways to handle a goals terminal. It all becomes . . should become at that moment very comprehensible to you.

You know that a present time problem is rough to handle. You know that it's sometimes very difficult to get rid of them. You know very often that they blow very easily. You know several processes that get rid of present time problems. They don't dismay you. You know that they take a little bit of monkeying with sometimes and it takes some two-way comm and so on. So don't be surprised if any of these things went. Don't be surprised if any of these things blew the goals terminal, see. So there's no reason for me to say didactically there's only one way to do this. No. We have just opened a wooden door and found that an iron door was there. And then we opened the iron door, and we're on our way, you see. There are many ways to do this.

Now, the proven way to do this is to assess on the Prehav Scale, get a five-way bracket and do a run. And that is a proven way to do that. So that is the way we will say you had better do at the moment. Because it shouldn't be too long a run. It shouldn't be as difficult a run as you've been doing.

All right. I just wanted to make it plain to you that there are other ways that you could handle the same situation because I think now you can understand what a goal is and what . . how goal stands in space, and then, therefore, what a goals terminal is.

A goals terminal is something that epitomizes both the goal and the resistive modifier. That would be the goals terminal you're looking for. It's the thing that epitomizes both of these things in one terminal.

Now, we admit that at one time or another one terminal had the goal and another terminal had the modifier and that there was a collision someplace along the two, and so forth.

We admit that there . . you could dream up all sorts of anatomy to all this, but where the pc is concerned, he never as-ises postulates which aren't his own. And we must consider that neither the goal nor the modifier are the pc's if they're still in suspense. They must belong to a terminal, ha-ha. You see that?

Actually, it's just the goal has been hanging out like a little, tiny red flag showing what the terminal was. Now, when we get the modifier, this really puts an enfilade fire on what the terminal is.

In other words, we got two tags on the terminal now. So we can get a more finite, squarely placed type of terminal. And admittedly, the terminal may be later on the track. Admittedly, the terminal may not take care of the entirety of the entire entire. But it'll certainly unbalance the goals terminal modifier . . pardon me, the goals and modifier situation. That'll certainly become unbalanced. And as fast as it does, you can expect a blow of that goals modifier situation. And as soon as that situation is gone, you of course are in the position of being able to do another complete Routine 3A. As soon as you can't get a knock on the goal, you can't get any reaction out of a terminal anymore, and you can't get any reaction out of a goal anymore and you can't get any reaction on a modifier anymore, that's it. You test all those things.

Now, how you do a repeat on this thing might prove a little more complicated than Routine 3 because you got to check the modifier and then check the goal. And then check the modifier and then check the goal again, before you give it all up. Because you could be fooled if you didn't.

You check the modifier. Now, the person has blown the terminal but still has the idea. You check the idea and the person looks at the idea and that idea sort of surges. You see, you look at the goal, let us say, and you get a surge on the goal. Now, the goal has surged, so you say, "Well, it's still alive, so we'd better do something else." No, no. It's not. It may not be at all.

You check the goal, then check the modifier, and we get a bang, bang, surge on the modifier. Now, we go back and check the goal, and we find it isn't there. Then we go back and try the modifier, and we find it isn't there. Because they will still stay hung up, and you've got to check both sides a couple of times to get them separated. The pc may still hang onto the idea after the terminal has gone.

You see, the pc's been living this life for a long time. But if you checked it off that way and thereafter couldn't get the goal to react and couldn't get the modifier to react, and then couldn't get the goal to react, and couldn't get the modifier to react; you get all of your rudiments in. You get all these terminals that you had. You check over all these terminals the pc also gave you. Make sure you got all that old terminals list

straight. Then we'd better get all the rudiments in like mad and we'd better check that goal again. We'd better check that modifier again. We can't get any tick out of them. We can't get any tick out of any of the rudiments. Then you go into a new Routine 3A. You got it? And you just go right down from the beginning again.

Of course, you use the pc's old list, the first goals list the pc gave you. This has to be assessed again. You will now find that some of those are alive. You naturally add to it anything. But you do the same thing you did, see. But instead of having pc write a goals list, your next run on this is take the pc's original goals list and anything that you added to it in assessing it. And then you add various types of goals to the list . . you know, new goals. And then you assess the whole list locating a goal by elimination. And then you go into it again. You ask for modifiers to that particular goal.

Now, when you've found the modifier for that goal, then you get a list of terminals for the goal and modifier. You assess the list of terminals, and here we go again. But I don't think you're going to be able to do that very much. I think after you get the first one, two or three, all of a sudden you're going to start getting blow, blow. And you'll find the goal and you'll get the modifier and it unsettles the two. And you never get to a Terminals Assessment. And you go boom, boom. And there you're left with empty hands again. And you keep on blowing these things, and I think you'll eventually blow most of the pc's goals list.

I think every one of them had a modifier. Tiny one that was overridden by the fixation of attention on the goal, don't you see. But once the goal is gone, these other ones start getting a little bit live, too.

Now, that's the way you would tackle this picture, and that's Routine 3A.

Now, you get . . let's take a case now that has been run with a goal. And let's say that goal was "to be a willow wand." Let's look over here, and we find that some cases will have just a modifier and we will have gotten the modifier before we got the goal. Now, I'm just only prepared to find that. I haven't found it, but I would be prepared to find it.

The person has come up on the goals list with a modifier. And you've got a pc sitting there who has a modifier. Now, you have to find the goal. But the goal will be right adjacent to the modifier and probably be in front of the modifier and not . . instead of behind the goal. Let's say somebody has one . . well, let's put something fairly factual: "To leave all hospitals alone." And we've gotten this as a goal. And it checked out on the goals list. And that's what we have: "To leave all hospitals alone."

Well, hey! You know, that really sounds like a modifier, doesn't it. So what's on the beginning of this thing? That's what we want to know now. We'd come over and we'd say, "All right. Well, what would you want to be doing which would be modified by leaving all hospitals alone and so forth? What would be the front end of this thing" I think you'd probably come up with the terminal or some terminal that the pc has already given you. You got the idea?

It possibly is . . let's say the terminal was "a willow wand" and "to leave all hospitals alone." Okay? "Leave all hospitals alone," and you want the goal. Well, the pc assessed out on a terminal, "a willow wand." Well, it may be something on the order . . you just ask the pc about it and sort it out.

"Who would want to leave all hospitals alone? Why or whatever . . what other goal would a person have? What goal would this modifier modify." You know, ask him any type of question which is just straight on. Explain to them anything that you want to explain to them, but try to get the front end of this thing, and you possibly will find it's "to be a willow wand and leave hospitals entirely alone."

Now, your terminals list is no longer the pc's terminals list. It's going to be different. And you say, all right. "Now, who or what would want to be a willow wand and want to leave all hospitals strictly alone?" And it doesn't make any sense to you, but it'll make sense to the pc. They've been living with it for trillennia.

Now, you'll get a very finite terminal. You get a very sharply defined terminal. It'll be distinctly different and well within the pc's reality of the situation. You should . . that's what you should do.

Now, I don't know that that has happened. And I haven't any case histories of that happening at all. I am just prepared for it to have been done. I'm just saying, well, there's a possibility here that after you've done . . I mean, in the future not just in the past. And you've worked and slaved, and you've sweated away, and you've gotten your goals list, and your goals list "to always jump out of second story windows." All right. Take it as a goal. And write it down. But remember, it's probably the modifier.

Now, just how you get around to that other end of it will be proved out in time, if we have to face this problem. I'm just facing the problem before we come to it.

And you say, "Well, what else . . what else would this goal consist of?" No reason to work hard at it. The pc very well might give you something idiotically simple like "Well! Well, to burn down houses, of course."

And you say, "Well, what would that consist of?"

"Well, to burn down houses and always jump out of the second story window." "Didn't I tell you before?" is liable to be sort of the idea behind all this.

Now, these goals that are total occluders like "and never find out about anything." If you had a goal like that, "Never find out . . to never find out about anything." It sounds to me like they were . . they wanted to or wanted to be or wanted to have, you know, and never find out about anything See, that's the whole goals modifier situation. So these things could be found backwards as well as forwards.

As I say, I don't know of these conditions. I've no experience with that at this particular time, but there's a provision for it.

All right. Now, how about the terminal that you are running on the pc right now? Will it do any harm whatsoever to leave it unflat? I don't know of any harm it'd do to leave it unflat because certainly the horribleness of this situation is this: is, that which is unknown to the pc, he tends to dramatize, he tends to be aberrated about. That which is unknown to him and is close to him and influencing him, he tends to be aberrated about. All right. What about this?

Well, if you've got a terminal on the pc and it's "to collect gold bricks," and we audit this pc, and the pc says, "Well, I'm very sad, and it makes me very apathetic" . . and we go on auditing the pc and gradually they climb out of this, but every once in a while he mentioned being apathetic about it and they're not quite happy about this and so on . . when we get the modifier, we are very likely to find out "and to act apathetic enough so nobody will find out that I have them." See, "to collect gold bricks and to act apathetic enough so that nobody will find out I have them," see. That's the modifier.

Yeah, but by having the goal, you've been kicking the goal, kicking the goal, kicking the goal and of course it's restimulating the modifier all the time. So the pc is acting like he doesn't have any engrams, acting like he doesn't have any bank, acting like he doesn't have any anything, don't you see, apathetically. It's all part of the modifier situation. Interesting, huh?

Well now, I think possibly some goals have been found which are the goal and modifier. I think this condition already possibly exists. "To be a willow wand and have everything go crazy." That's obviously a goal-plus-modifier situation.

There's numerous conditions of this, but if you just get down the basic anatomy of it, you're all set. You've got to find a goal. See, you've got to find a goal and that's just routinely. And then, having found the goal, you've got to find the modifier. Or if while doing the goal you got only a modifier and it was only the modifier available, now you've got to find the rest of it which is the goal. You've got to get this package.

And then you've got to get the terminal that fits both. Your pc may have a struggle giving you one that fits both or he may not. But the terminal that fits the both of them, of course, is giving you seven-league boots in the direction of clearing because it's got both sides of the problem. And it's got the individual

who epitomizes both sides of these things and you should be able to roll along with it rather well, rather easily. It should be a faster run, in other words. You haven't lost any ground, particularly. You've just won some ground here in this particular wise.

Now, we take . . what I want you to do if you have found . . if your pc has a goal, well, just enter in here . . you've already got the goal proven out . . I don't care if they have a terminal and it's been run or anything else . . just enter in here at step 4, take that goal, compile a list of modifiers, and go right on down the remaining steps of Routine 3A. You'll find you'll shortcut this situation.

There is the rest of the package is what you've got to find. Instead of running off one-half of this thing to unsettle the goals-modifier situation . . . You see, actually, it would unsettle if you just ran off half of the problem. It's a longer run. Let's find the one that unsettles both sides of the thing simultaneously and is contained in one person. And I think you'll find in that all of circuitry the pc's been packing around and all of the hidden standards and anything else will probably be combined in these things.

This is not very hard to do. This is not very hard to do. It shouldn't take you very long. I'll go over it once more. I just . . you know what the pc's goal is, and just say, "Well, what would make that goal difficult to attain?" "What would make it impossible?" "What would be the consequences of attaining it?" Any such question as that, or if somebody's heard this lecture, say, "Well, what's the modifier to your goal?" It's as elementary as this, you know.

And then you make a whole list of these things, you see. And when you've got your list done, just assess 'em by elimination. Then you find yourself with your goals . . goal plus modifier. And now that whole thing, by the way, will react. It'll react very nicely. You never saw a goal react as nicely as when it's combined with a modifier. Bang! Bang!

All right. Now, take that goal plus modifier and ask for a terminals list: "Who or what would want to be a willow wand and jump out of second story windows? And, you know, who would want to play a violin without any strings? What would? What would play a violin without any strings?" and so forth. And he'd give you a very short list. Doesn't matter whether the list is short or long, the idea is just to get a complete list.

Well, you shake that list down. You shake, of course, the modifier list down. You say, "Well, are there any more modifiers?" You get no reaction on the E-Meter. Similarly, when you've got your terminals, you say, "Well, are there any more terminals that you can think of now?" Well, that's blank.

All right. Do your Assessment by Elimination. Get your rudiments in, of course, frequently and routinely if you want to do a smooth, fast job of it. Do your Assessment by Eliminations, and you'll wind up with his terminal.

As soon as you've got that terminal, the easiest way to handle a terminal and the one that you understand best is to assess it on the Prehav Scale and you will find that there it sits, and put a five-way bracket together or something on that thing and just run it. And it's simple. There's not too much to that.

It requires auditing skill, however, to do this. This is what fools the untrained, relatively, or partially trained auditor. Everything I have told you sounds very simple. And it is very simple. But that is the trouble with it. So many things can be added to it, so many complications. And what people always neglect . . and they won't admit this about themselves . . is good auditing requires a superb auditor.

You have to have good auditing skill . . just the mechanics of auditing have to be excellent . . in order to audit. And you can't do one of these things with a halfway-through-HPA mechanics of auditing. That's all.

I mean, your pc is too far out. Your rudiments are too far out. You're juggling with the E-Meter in one hand and something else in the other hand and trying to smoke a cigarette at the same time with your feet on this window sill. And just somehow or another you can't seem to get anything to work so you eventually . . and you say, "Well, it's perfectly all right." Don't know the Auditor's Code, you see. You say, "It's perfectly all right. I know what this person's modifier is. I know what it is already," and

evaluate for it and say, “Well, it’s actually ‘a husband.’ That’s what I ought to be running. Assess for a husband, you see, and just kind of pick out the level at random and put it in the command and run it all.”

Yeah, obviously the person has done Routine 3A, only there’s no visible result. It’s all mysterious. It takes weeks and weeks and weeks to do the Terminal Assessment. They just can’t seem to get a terminal, or the terminal they got . . you get ahold of a sheet they did the terminal on, it hasn’t got any marks on it. You say, “Well, what is this? What is it?”

And they say, “Well, that’s the terminal list.”

“Well, what did you do with it?”

“Well, we picked out the best terminal, of course.”

It’s the complications that foul this up, but basically, as a hidden background to all of this type of activity, is superb auditing skill. It is good auditing presence. It’s being able to hold a pc in-session.

Why so particularly with this? See? I mean, you can go halfway through an HPA Course and give a Security Check and miss a question, the guy’s upset for a couple of days, and somebody else gets the question and straightens it out, and so forth. And everybody lives, you see. And it’s all all right. But what makes this so peculiar?

Well, in the first place . . I’ve been asking this question, you see, myself from the first time it happened that Peter . . who I just got through training in running a course in South Africa, and he got well trained running that course and he did very well and the students did well and Peter goes home to Australia and he has a six-weeks course . . I think it was during the first week we had nearly all the goals and terminals. We were very upset because there were two or three students that didn’t have any goal or terminal at the beginning of the second or third week down in South Africa, wasn’t it? Oh, we were quite peeved. And he goes through six weeks, and I don’t think he had enough goals and terminals to put in your eye. He had three or four. He made two Clears on a particular unit which was very well done. But he didn’t get any goals and he didn’t get any terminals worth a nickel.

And it’s worried him sick. He says, “Why does everybody take forever to do it?”

And I was sitting down here at the beginning of this summer and so forth and everybody was having such an awful time doing it. Relatively skilled auditors. So we started shaping up auditing skill. That’s what we started working on . . the smoothness and the skill of the auditor and sure enough, when I finally got down to it just relatively a month or two ago (a couple of months ago) I said . . you remember how discourteous I was . . I said, “Well, you’re in a games condition with the pc, and you just haven’t got the rudiments in, and that’s all there is to it and find them.” Remember? Everybody all of a sudden busily got the rudiments in and bang-bang-bang, everybody had their goals and terminals. Remember?

It’s a crime now if at the end of two weeks of two-and-a-half-hour-a-day auditing when we haven’t got somebody’s goal and terminal; it just seems to be very, very peculiar. And we begin to think of the case as peculiar and we wonder what the auditor is doing, really. And so on. Lots of questions get asked. Well, what is that basically? That’s twenty-five hours of auditing

If it’s gone twenty-five hours without this result, why, “What? Oh, don’t tell me that case hasn’t got his goal and terminal yet. Hey, wait a minute. What’s this?” And it’s just all based on this one thing: Superb auditing skill. That is all.

Why? All summer long I wanted to know this burning three letter word why. It’s because every time you ask for a goal, the modifier restimulates and the modifier is usually a disability. It’s as silly as that. So you’re walking uphill the whole distance that you’re doing a Goals Assessment. But, of course, it becomes dead easy after you’ve got the goal and the modifier because you’re no longer kicking against the modifier.

Let's say we're looking for this goal. Now, we don't know what the goal is. We have a list of two hundred goals and we don't know what the goal is. But beforehand, before we find out what the goal is, let us take a future peek with a crystal ball, and we find the goal is "to be a lute player and hate everyone horribly."

Well, that's fine. Now, we're looking down here, and we finally get down. . . We've gone across "lute player" every time we turn around and we go three or four goals further than "lute player," and we found that the rudiments all out. Why? Well, the pc is hating everyone horribly.

Now, we don't know that the pc has got this as a goal and we didn't even know the modifier was there. So as we come down the dress parade, see, we keep crossing this. And every time we hit the goal, we restimulate the modifier. So the pc goes out of session.

Now, in view of the fact that all the other goals on the list have modifiers too, look at the potpourri which finally finishes up here. Oh, we find this pc ARC breaks with the greatest of ease and we finally find out that we have dug up a goal which says "to be a lute player and hate everybody horribly," and we had "to hate everybody horribly" in full restim the entirety of the Goals Assessment, right down to the time when we got it as a modifier. It's right there.

And you have to be good enough as an auditor and smooth enough as an auditor that this thing never has a ripple to get moving on. It's got to be done perfectly. And when it's done perfectly, it never, of course, knocks. And if it does, you put it straight back in place. And you get down to the end of the list with perfect auditing, of course, you found the person's goal and terminal rather easily.

Ah, but let's look at somebody else someplace who is not that well trained. Every time they drop the command, drop the ball, drop the E-Meter, let the cigarette go out and so forth, and make noises as they remove and take off and put on their shoes, you see, during the auditing session, and some things like this, and just miss here and there, you know, like . . well, miss clearing the command and miss starting the session, and, you know, few misses of that character. And what happens?

The pc goes dzu-dzu-uzz-uzz, you know? Because remember, even though you don't know it, you haven't pushed the pc into this valence. The pc was sitting in this valence all the time from the moment he walked in and got his first auditing He is solidly in the valence. And the closer you get to the valence, of course, the less he is in it, but until you've got the whole thing, you're living right on a borderline. You see, you're not in it, you're in it and so forth. And if there's a hidden part of it that you're never mentioning, that thing will just start going alive like a small volcano.

And anything you do which crosses the goals-terminal-line mores throws the thing into full panoply. So here we go. And we find him hating you horribly. He doesn't know why.

"Never, never find anything anyplace." Well, of course, this makes a tough, tough assessment. But what do you know? You can actually assess across such a level. You can actually assess across such a modifier.

Now, let's say we had a modifier like "and never to let anyone come close to me, ever." Oh, man, think of what that would do. You'd do a sort of a detour around the goal every time. You'd get down toward the goal . . now that it's position is known by the pc reactively . . you get down toward the goal. The second that you got on the goal, you'd get an ARC break just before you got to the goal. Or you'd get something going here, and you'd never . . the pc'd never be reached. He would have made his modifier. It isn't his goal. It's his modifier.

So you finally get the goal, but the modifier is still there, so the pc is therefore hard to audit. So I can get you to look forward to some much easier auditing. It isn't so difficult to get the terminal or hold the pc into a Prehav level run if you've got the modifier. That becomes very easy auditing.

Why? Because the fangs are gone out of the situation. You're just auditing both sides of it. The pc knows full well it's "to hate everybody, horribly." And he'll even make a wisecrack at you. You'd better not make a wisecrack at the pc. The pc can always make a wisecrack about his own . . . There's a little rule in

this that's almost a technical fact. The pc can always joke about his own goal or terminal, but you'd better not. You get some of the sourest looks. It's quite amusing.

But anyway, there was the trickiness back of it all. But this doesn't say that it requires less trickiness in the future. It requires the same amount or better auditing to get that goal. Particularly if the pc knows you're now going to pull his modifier, and the pc is liable to sit there saying, "Well, let's see. Oh, that's my goal, huh? To be a lute player. Well, that's pretty good. I wonder what the modifier is. Hm, do you suppose it's so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so? I hate everybody horribly." Pc is kind of doing a self-audit on it, you know. And you've got to hold him in line and get it anyhow.

So it might be a little tougher to get the goal than it was before on somebody that's aware of this. And it might not be. But some of you are going to laugh madly about the final modifier that appears after your goal because this is the craziest thing anybody ever heard of. It'll be something that makes it just . . it's just the complete volte-vis. There you were minding your own business and all you wanted to do was play the violin and so forth. And yet there's this whole long tail on this kite . . particularly hit people over the heads with it or something like this, you see. Or "to play a violin so that I will never under God's green earth become God." Oh, that kind of thing, you see.

It's "so I will never become," "so I will not have," "so it will not happen." These are all denyers. Now, the mechanics, the basic mechanics of this, are pretty easy to see. You don't have to say that these things were implanted into the pc. You don't have to say they were. You don't have to figure it out this way . . or that the pc implanted it into somebody else.

The pc will immediately realize that this makes quite a game. But in the past, when you started to run the game out, you were running up against the modifier. And the first few levels of the Prehav Scale would find a pc pretty . . feeling pretty bad because the modifier was in and it wasn't as-ising.

But the games condition involved with it gives us a great understanding of it. The pc has a goal "to build or make violins," let us say. Well, what do you think happens in the course of existence? The person goes on for millennia and he's a good violin maker and he's going to make violins. What do you think'll eventually happen? He'll eventually, certainly, pick up a packaged counter-postulate, won't he? Thetans being thetans.

For instance, we're building a beautiful fireplace out here. People have been coming by making the wildest cracks about that sort of thing. You've got to be awfully careful because it . . the state bricklayer is about to drop a brick or two on their heads, you see. But it's a perfectly nice fireplace. Very effective and so forth. It hasn't got any of its trim or anything, so it merely looks massive. But they can't see something like this happening as a forward goal without adding a counter-postulate. You got the idea? They just can't do it. They're in a games condition with life, and any degree whatsoever, why, somebody says, "I would like to teach cats to race." Somebody . . the least somebody's liable to say is, "Well, it's been tried," or "I don't think it'd be easy to do that." And if you had a mother or a father who was particularly in a games condition with life, everything you said got something of this order, don't you see?

So your overt, of course, is that you've been doing it too. And one gets into this sort of thing . . somebody has an ambition to shoot your head off, you're liable to get a counter-postulate on the subject. And you're liable to say, "No, you shouldn't have such a goal." And you're liable to dream this up in such a way, "Well, only madmen have goals of that character."

And eventually you could see that the person would wind up with a goal something on this order: "To shoot everybody's head off, even though only madmen do it." You see, he'd get the same combo. He'd get . . the goal and the modifier would get united to some degree.

Well, that's all well and good, and that would apparently work out all right, but there's this other piece of nonsense connected with this thing One must have overts on the person who has the goal and modifier. See, it's the other person that has done that, and the overts of the pc are against the person who has the goal and modifier. It's very complicated, isn't it. Somebody else has to have the goal and modifier. Otherwise, if they were the pc's terminals, they would have as-ised. I mean, if they were the pc's ideas or

postulates, they would have as-ised right now. But they haven't; they're still stuck there. So the other way of sticking them is to have them in a terminal.

And you get the goal plus modifier in a terminal which doesn't have the postulates that the pc has, see? So the postulates, goal plus modifier, belong to a terminal, and now the pc is against the terminal. And that's the way you get that out. The pc's overts and other rambunctiousness against this terminal and the overwhelmingness of the terminal toward the pc, eventually winds the pc up in this terminal which has this goal and modifier.

We can see how the goal and modifier got together. That's very easy to see. But how did they get perpetuated to this degree so they never got as-ised; well, you put them in a valence, see, and you had nothing to do with the ideas of the valence and of course, they didn't as-is. That's about all there is to the mechanics of the situation. It's not actually a very difficult, mechanical situation. It's more humorous than not, because once you start looking over the modifiers which are actually on the ends of the purest of goals . . why, this goal is the purest, sweetest goal you ever saw. You could just hear Brahms playing in the distance, you see. It's just marvelous, but it winds up with something like "and never tolerate anyone if I can kill them first," you know. See, or something weird like this, you see.

"To benefit all children . . " I just leave it up in the air. What you can count on is that it will be a denyer . . there'll be a denyer about it. It'll be something missing about it all. The thing will be worded in such a way as to say it isn't there. And that it will modify the living daylights out of it and it'll give you an entirely different, more finite real terminal picture which i9 very central to the pc's immediate case and worries.

All this is pretty easy. Do you find anything difficult about it? HCO Bulletin of November 7, 1961 covers all of this data. I've been going over it with you because I want you to do it now. As soon as you audit your pc again, I want you to perform those actions just like that.

Now, you can go ahead and get these things checked out and go through them as before and so on because they're relatively easy to check out. You think you can do this all right? This thing . . this thing looks pretty simple. All right. Might not look simple to you. Does it look simple?

Audience: Yes.

All right.

You can see that a funny thing has happened here is: the front end stays as hard or even harder and all of a sudden the routine gets much easier down toward the end. Well, let me say that this thing only works when accompanied by Security Checks.

I was rather interested in a very well known auditor who won't come near anybody for any training Hasn't for years and years and years and years and years. And he was insisting somebody find his goal and terminal for him. But he wouldn't have it done if he were going to get a Security Check too. And somebody has actually consented to do a Goals Terminals Assessment on that person on those conditions. I imagine the tail end of that goal is "to get help and kill myself in the process," because he actually would know better than to do something like that . . even him. But I think that's quite amusing. So a Security Check must go along with Routine 3A, and you'll find the most fruitful Security Check that you can run on a pc . . it requires a bit of an imagination and skill . . is to do a Dynamic Assessment on the pc. We've been doing this . . you've been getting this in your auditor's report notes and so forth, and I've not said too fabulous much about it. But if you can get a Dynamic Assessment and get the dynamic that is out and then compartment the dynamic . . I gave you a lecture on it but I'm just saying you do this off the cuff. You don't need a lot of paraphernalia. And sec check that dynamic smartly on the pc, you actually will pull what the pc considers withholds. You will pull those much more strongly.

And I'd like to add one more note. This is almost enough discoveries for one lecture, wouldn't you say offhand? The Earth shakes when you look at something like this. I actually . . I feel a little bit contrite about suddenly giving you a steer to this degree. It was quite startling to me that a piece of the jigsaw puzzle was sitting right there, you know. There was a missing piece of the puzzle right there that was

making it much harder and it was making it much longer and much more arduous. Yeah, you can do it by running out one side only, but it is evidently much harder.

Now, there's another piece of the puzzle. That's enough, and I should say nothing more about it, but I can't forbear, as long as I brought up Security Checking, to give you an interesting little discovery on the subject of Security Checking.

The person who will not . . I found this out the other evening . . a person who will not admit to overts or withholds or react on overts or withholds, will react on a direct not-know question. You know, they don't consider it an overt, really, and they don't consider they have a withhold and the sec check question would be clear, otherwise, will apparently react on a whole channel, particularly on another person with a not-know question.

But it's a simple one. Not the original not-know version that came out two or three months ago, but a very simple version such as . . well, let's say we're security checking an employee, and we'd simply say, "Well, what doesn't your boss know?''

Now, you could have said, "What have you done to your boss? What have you withheld from your boss?" and you wouldn't have gotten any reaction on the needle.

But if you say, "What doesn't your boss know?" Or "What have you done that your boss doesn't know about?" You get needle response. That's quite interesting. That's an interesting thing to know. Just this little piece of stuff.

As you go down the line, you'll very often find this girl. She's been very unhappily married for years, or find this guy and he's been having an awful hard time, and you say, "Well, what have you done to your wife?"

And he says, "Nothing" He's never done anything to her? "Well, what have you withheld from her?"

"Nothing. Never withheld anything from her."

And I can put this little slingshot in your hands which is "Well, what doesn't your wife know?" BOOM! Evidently it isn't a crime, but it's an awful reaction because it's a basic disagreement. You're asking for the most fundamental disagreement there is . . the reason the trick works. He knows something she doesn't know. And, of course, that's the most fundamental disagreement there is. And of course you're asking right at the center of overts and withholds. And after you've got these off, don't be surprised if he explains it all to you that these are overts and that these are withholds, and you'll now get reactions on overts and withholds. Never considered them overts before. But now, after you've stripped this one little question off . . just "What doesn't (blank) know?" is the clue to all of this. That's the wording that goes into it.

You're liable to get all sorts of ramifications to the whole thing, but they will eventually come down to needle reaction on it. It's a good thing to know, good thing to use.

All right. Finishing off this data on Routine 3A, who is to use Routine 3A. Well, I would say anybody who has been thoroughly trained at Saint Hill can use Routine 3A. Who else can use Routine 3A? Nobody. Is that plain enough? I think we'd save an enormous number of casualties by just laying it down right there. And of course, having laid that down and having publicized it broadly and so forth, just look at the people you could make guilty when they come limping in and saying, "Well, I went around to Glutz up in Chicago. And they get your bulletins regularly. They're sent in to them by the AMA and so on. And they found my goal and terminal all right, and ran me on it. And then ever since that time I've had this . . this . . this odd . . this odd leaping sensation, and so forth." Well, at that time, remember you at least have the solace of being able to make them guilty also, and say, "Well, why didn't you get the cotton out of your ears the time you were told nobody was supposed to use this except certain definitely trained auditors?"

Okay? Well, it’s all yours. Go ahead. I’m not going to . . probably tonight, aside from one or two, I’m not going to do too much with your reports. I’m going to be very interested in tomorrow night when you’ve had a crack at all this. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you.

All right. Well, it’s all yours.

Thank you very much.