ROUTINE 3D

A lecture given on
14 November 1961

Thank you.

Aw, I didn't think you'd be glad to see me today after this bulletin change and so forth. Maybe it was Mary Sue you were glad to see. Is that right?

Okay. Now, the first talk on Routine 3D, and I'm going to go over the Information Letter with you which is undated because I typed it.

This is now complete except for commands.

Now, let's take up the history of clearing. A tremendously smooth, interested job of auditing in the days when we didn't have rudiments could make a Clear. A tremendously smooth job of auditing, that took up a person's engrams that were quite visible, that brought him into a condition where he could see his pictures and where he could confront his track. And that was a long time ago. A very long time ago. And only me could do this.

Now, the world of psychiatry has never at any time, or psychology, believed otherwise than that I was quite a practitioner. What they don't like is that I wanted somebody else to be able to do it. That was the unforgivable sin.

Well, it was not only an unforgivable sin, it is almost an insurmountable problem. It was, actually, something on the order of except for here and there, here and there . . I suppose you could have counted them on the fingers of one hand . . an auditor isolatedly would make a Clear. That was somewhere from 1940 . . well, others auditing them . . from somewhere around 1950 to about 1958. Wasn't that ACC '58?

All right. Now, on that ACC, I did assessments based on a Dynamic Assessment, went down the line and, working directly at circuits and machinery and so forth, assessed that whole class. We got something . . I don't remember how many were on that class . . I think there were about fifty-five or something like that . . it was quite a large size class in Washington and we got fifteen people who went Clear. I didn't do any of the auditing. All I did was some assessment on the thing.

Now, that was a rather fabulous average, but for the first time somebody else auditing had made a Clear. That was the milestone there. But remember I had done the assessments.

Well, time went on and trying to teach somebody how to assess, trying to put into communication, frankly, the various factors, trying to make them relayable, had to bring any knowledge connected with this out of the realm of the intuitive where I was concerned into the realm of the cold, mechanical part well expressed, so that it would communicate. Now, that's been the roughest part of this. And trying to bring about a condition in an auditor where, through training and so forth, his auditing was sufficiently smooth to keep the pc from balling up on ARC breaks and other rudiments and so forth; trying to develop a technology which would teach and a technology which would apply auditing has been a very tough run.

But if you look at the actual number of years involved, it's not very long The first auditors I tried to teach was in 1949. That was before there was any Foundation. And they made a dog's breakfast out of it, you know. I mean, they really did. And it began to dawn on me that they weren't doing something I was doing. Only, this really didn't dawn on me at all until 1955 when a chap in the organization in Phoenix had been watching me audit on television and he made a very interesting observation. He says, "You know, you acknowledge everything a pc says." And by George, you know, I'd never thought to remark it. Now, it was that kind of differences.

So we had to get together and assemble all these parts. What did constitute an auditing session, see, what did put this together?

Now, it wasn't that I was so wonderful. It was the fact that I could do it. This was something I could do and trying to find ways and means of getting somebody else to do it was quite interesting because I myself down through the years have enormously improved my own auditing I am not doing something and then teaching you to do what I am doing. That is not what's been happening.

I've had to find the actual parts necessary to make auditing occur. And then I've used them all myself. As a matter of fact, my auditing right here at this instant is sort of shot. It's in very bad shape because I've been rewriting the end rudiments. And when I do Model Session now, I don't use the old Model Session, I really haven't learned the new Model Session and you haven't even got it yet. So that's sort of the way it's been going.

I started this originally on the CCHs. I sat down and tried to do a perfect Tone 40 job to find out whether or not this could be done, if it was doable and so forth and had to retrain myself to this new skill . . a Tone 40 job of auditing as done on the CCHs.

And that was quite revelatory to me, because I found out with great personal reality for the first time that I could myself do these things with a definite improvement of my own auditing In other words, by knowing how to do these things, my own auditing got better.

So as time went on, we developed the Model Session. Of course, the TRs were developed, the Model Session, the other parts of auditing And frankly, we were learning things about the E-Meter as a short time ago as three months ago, we were learning things about the E-Meter. For instance, the last thing which turned up about the E-Meter was instant read. There's some possibility that something else could be learned about an E-Meter, but I decided about June that we knew practically everything there was to know about an E-Meter, and I wrote a textbook which you have as E-Meter Essentials and there's only one real datum in that missing. And that datum is simply instant read versus latent read. And that's all that's missing in that textbook.

Now, I learned a lot about this meter in experimental runs and so forth but, basically, trying to teach people how to use the meter. And it was unbelievably tough. And to this day Instructors do not believe what they see in people learning how to use an E-Meter. And on the US courses, Instructors have developed a mechanism of using . . of how to use the E-Meter which is kind of a drill. And they have an auditor and a pc mock-up session, with the auditor actually asking the pc questions on the cans. And then they have a third student who stands back of the auditor and studies the reaction of the meter. And an Instructor is there and says, "What reaction was that?" And this is a drill which is actually teaching people to use an E-Meter.

They . . apparently an enormous percentage of people in reading a meter just don't ever see the needle move. This is sort of buggy. But it is a fact and something that you should remember in teaching people to use the E-Meter.

Now, where you have an instrument of as precise a character as the E-Meter and where you have a thing as intricate as the human mind, you have to have a very skilled operator in order to carry something through, as far as the meter is concerned. The person really has to know what he's doing. And although you could probably get away innocently in earlier years with sitting there watching the E-Meter wobble and being learned about it and not really knowing what it was saying or doing, you had this as a protective factor, if you please: there were no technologies of sufficient bulldozer quality to actually plow somebody up. The technology itself was not up to a total massed battery sort of an action. But today that is different. Now, the technology which I'm about to go over with you here and which you as a class are already using, this technology . . this is wild stuff. I mean, it is definitely of a high bulldozer quality.

You realize that if you miss in running Routine 3 . . if you miss in running Routine 3 . . you could practically bury the pc. What you are using, in essence, is so strong and so heavy, is so powerful that if you choose the wrong items on any one of this sequence of items and then audit the final result on the pc, and then if you don't check the number of levels coming alive and don't find out you're wrong, you can

practically plow him under, almost as surely as Roosevelt plowed under pigs. Can practically wipe him out.

The bank becomes more solid. Any tone level the pc is in will get more and more so. It won't relieve. It just gets more so. The pc feels a little bit sad and the next thing you know the pc feels sadder. Not downscale sadder, but more volume at that tone level. And if you keep it up, the pc feels much sadder and much, much, much, much, much sadder. Get the idea?

The whole case is becoming stronger on the aberrated manifestations of the case.

All right. There are techniques, now, which we sought to classify as the relatively unskilled technique. But what do you know? Routine 1, similarly, can cause a mess. How?

The Security Checking. If a person does a bad metering job and misses one Security Check question or one rudiment, he's had it. He's had it. I mean, that becomes a dog's breakfast at once. So Routine 3 itself provided means by which you could quickly spot whether or not the pc was running right because if you got the goal and you got the terminal, assessed it on the Prehav Scale and ran it for a while and then went back to the Prehav Scale, don't you see, and checked it again, well, more levels were alive so you'd better do something and it was wrong.

Well, that was all right as a remedy, but the truth is that the errors being made with it were far more gross than that. One error: run a level only so long as the tone arm is moving well. And as soon as you get the tone arm moving well, you assess for a new level and run that.

And let me tell you. If you do that to a pc, he feels like he's going crazy. He's got two levels live simultaneously, which is quite remarkable as a mental sensation. If you yourself have had that as a mental sensation, you know what I'm talking about. And of course, here you've been rounced off one process onto another and so forth, and sometimes the other process wasn't flat. And for a day or so you feel zzzzzzz. Well, it's much worse than that if you grossly mishandle these things.

There is a whole body of technology, now, lost in the yesterdays which could be applied by an auditor, and we put that under Class I-type auditing And, actually, a lot of that auditing is relegated to co-audit. And some of you will . . as soon as you get the new co-audit processes on which I am working at this particular moment . . as soon as you get these new co-audit processes, you'll see what I'm talking about.

But old Rising Scale Processing, if you please, is going to be run in co-audits by the veriest amateurs. They just come in. They sit down. What is a pc? A pc is a policeman. You know? They don't know a thing about it. And here you have it that they can actually get away with Rising Scale Processing. It's quite remarkable what they can get away with.

We will have a whole body of skills there which are still meter proof, pc proof and that won't overwhelm a pc. But what we're dealing with right now, when we moved into the zone and realm of clearing a small percentage of people . . that is to say the technique was adequate for clearing a small percentage of people . . we were on the edge of things which required only the greatest technical accuracy. And when we have moved into Routine 3D, let me assure you that you are not just on the edge of technical accuracy, you had certainly better know your parts of auditing, your E-Meter and the whole ruddy lot.

And anybody fool enough to permit himself to be audited on Routine 3D by somebody who has to continually fumble with the directions and "Let's see. What do I do now?" and so forth, out in the public, of course he's just trying to commit suicide. I mean, it's at that level of magnitude, because you have here a body of technology which is actually stronger than the human mind.

The pc has no chance of resisting the error. That's something for you to think about. In earlier days, yes you could say, "Well, go ahead and audit anybody on anything you want to. It'll settle out in three to ten days," see.

Well, we've moved into a body at the same time that we start clearing broadly, clearing any large percentage of the pcs who sit down in the pc chair . . as soon as we move into that, we have, of course,

moved into technology which in itself looks like massed bazookas and atomic rockets, and so forth. That's the way it looks to the fellow in the human mind.

In the first place, he's sitting there in-session. The technology you have just about sessions and that sort of thing puts him in-session willy-nilly. He can't do anything else but to go into session if the auditor knows his business. And then you go and run this. There isn't any way he can say no.

So the responsibility an auditor takes for the use of this particular routine is very great. His responsibility, however, should not be on the basis of being cautious and trembling and chewing his fingernails and all that sort of thing His responsibility factor should be simply on the side of knowing his business, feeling comfortable in a session, being able to conduct a session in a very efficient and effective way. It's relatively easy to do that today, but it is something to do.

And therefore, I adjure you . . when people ask you about Routine 3 or Clearing or shouldn't they use Clearing, you know, and shouldn't they do this and shouldn't they do that . . I ask you for your support in telling them quite firmly, quite firmly, "Well, when you are a perfect Class II Auditor . . when you're perfect as a Class II Auditor . . and when you have studied assessing very hard, why, yes. But right now we're thinking about you being a perfect Class II Auditor. That's what we're thinking about. And if you can reach that classification, you're fine."

Practically any technology that existed from 1949 straight through to, let us say, 1955, 1956 is total bait for a Class I Auditor. Now, if a fellow wants to audit with no training and sloppy and just do it any old way and so forth, remember those techniques were designed in a large degree to be mishandled.

But I want to impress upon you the fact that the techniques which we're talking about at this moment. . . Even a Security Check can go wrong, you understand. You can upset the living daylights out of a pc by just misreading one question on a Security Check. From that point forward, particularly through the Clearing routines now, we have passed into another world. We have passed into a world of high effectiveness. And your auditing must be as effective as the techniques which you are administering. And the techniques which you are administering are fantastically effective.

All right. The birth of Routine 3D came about on a pressure basis because I could see very clearly that on a lot of cases it was going to require another two months on what we were doing to round them up. And I had to cut that down. And I've been doing nothing since February of 1961 but cut down the amount of time necessary to audit a case and increase the percentage of wins. That's all I've been interested in.

And I had a lot of this data in the background. And when it became obvious to me that having released the modifier and seeing what the modifier had been doing, and how that had actually buried goals out of the way and made the student upset in, you know, in a session. You know it's a hidden thing that tells him to be upset. So he goes on and he's upset. And every time you audit the terminal, why, it kicks a little bit harder and so on. It takes a long time to wear this thing out.

Well, I decided we didn't have time to wear it out and released the techniques about the modifier. All right. The discovery of the modifier was handed on to you very rapidly and you promptly took 12 Ω hours to find a modifier. I never dreamed it. I considered that a modifier would require thirty minutes. You see, there's this slight difference of estimate here.

Almost everything that you complain about in Scientology is based on that same error, however. You should understand it. I'm not trying to hide the error. My optimism is based entirely upon what I can do or what auditors can do who are auditing exactly what I tell them. You know, right under the gun.

And these are out as soon as that technique drifts out beyond this perimeter that I just named, you see, something else happens to it. So we must take very good precautions that that doesn't happen to Routine 3D. You've got to be able to do Routine 3D here, and you've got to be able to do Routine 3D anyplace you go and be able to do it well and with confidence. So there's pressure on the training line.

You're feeling that pressure. You're getting ARC broke by being posted, and if you study twice as hard as the highest student and get five times as many passes as you did last week, if you get the fire company

to lift you up on one of their ladders, you will get into the failed category. You know, I mean, this kind of super pressure. That's why you're getting this pressure.

But a lot of you are leaving here in the middle of December. All right. That gives me something on the order of five auditing weeks. I'm going to make the grade in five auditing weeks over my dead body or your dead body. Just so we don't make it over the top of any dead thetans.

So therefore, I went to work on this promptly. I studied all the folders involved and found out that here was twelve hours to find a modifier, and some of the modifiers weren't even found, and everybody was busy stumbling around about this. Well, I first thought the best thing to do was just turn around and educate you thoroughly on the subject of Dianetic bouncers, callbacks, denyers, all that old technology, haul it out of the grab bag and reeducate you into the thing, and teach you how to use repeater technique on the pc to wear out phrases and all this sort of thing. But that's not very advantageous, is it?

So all of a sudden I realized that the only reason a modifier was there was because the goal was opposed. Ah, well, let's get a modifier in an entirely different way.

Let's take all of the parts that oppose the individual and get them first and then come back to the modifier and the thing'll fall into your lap. And at the same time you've got the opposition and you've got opposition goals, and you have finally achieved the anatomy of the problem, which is the goal of the pc. He thinks of it as a goal. Actually, it is not. It is a problem.

It is his effort to do something opposed, and those two have hung in balance, one against the other, for eons. We're not dealing, now, with a problem that lasted since last Tuesday. We're dealing with a problem which has lasted, probably, the last hundred trillion years. We've got the goal locked up against all accumulated opposition and they're equally opposed, one to the other. And having that, we then have the whole thing laid out before U8 as to why a pc is hung up as he is hung up.

The data on prior confusion has unlocked a number of doors on this. That is why you don't have any commands yet laid out for this, because there are some versions of command, which I am checking out while you find these parts. I know we can do it. It's just how fast can we do it that counts.

All right. So I went ahead and worked out and tested this entire routine over one short weekend. That's fantastic, but it was tested, straightened out, taped, and everything. And at once, into my lap fell the answers as to why only a small percentage of people go Clear. And why in finding a goal you have such difficulty keeping the rudiments in; because, of course, the goal is opposed by an opposing idea and is susceptible to instant invalidation and so disappears like that.

And therefore, we have the hardest part of Routine 3 being the first part of Routine . . 3D rather, being the first part of Routine 3D. And it's the same old part of Routine 3, and they have missed, missed, missed, missed, missed throughout this year on doing a Goals Assessment. I have seen some of them just become endless. I've seen people get up to a thousand goals.

I'll give you some idea of how much improvement has been along this line. Right here a very well known Instructor, auditing a pc I am looking at went through weeks and weeks of a Goals Assessment and ran up to some astronomic number of goals and so forth, just this last summer. And with a lot of experience under his belt, that same Instructor got the goal and terminal Routine 3 style on a pc in, I think . . from what I've seen on the cable . . must have been a weekend. Oh, that's an improvement someplace.

It looks like we've found some of the missing parts already before we moved into 3D. It looks like we found how we actually can do a Goals Assessment. We can do a Goals Assessment by doing perfect Model Session, perfect E-Metering, and keeping the rudiments in, in, in, in, in. If it gets as bad as doing five minutes worth of assessing and fifteen minutes worth of rudiments in, that's the way you'd have to do it. But you can do it now. It is a doable action. So in go the rudiments, and there goes the goal and we've got it.

Now, the first part, then, of Routine 3D is as difficult today as it ever was in Routine 3. But the technology today of exactly how you find them . . although it hasn't changed . . we know exactly why

they can't be found, is the rudiments go out. And it's just that simple. The rudiments go out so the goal can't be found, and a lot of you right here were into that rat race, utterly unbelievable.

The South African ACC, I don't think it took us . . I don't . . I was around there scolding one day because we had several students . . I mean, I think we were almost a week deep in the course or something like that . . we had several students who didn't have terminals yet. Didn't seem to me to be reasonable. And poor Peter and Mary Sue said, "Well, we apologized and got to work." And they themselves, then, shoved the E-Meter down the pc's throat practically and straightened him up and got the goal and terminal on a high duress basis.

Poor Peter goes back to Australia from South Africa, and he sits down with a great big class of people and nobody could find any goals. And what had happened? And right here this was happening. We just weren't able to find goals.

And then finally I sorted this whole thing out and came down to just one conclusion: Auditors were in a sort of a games condition with one another, and it was all a matter of rudiments. If you kept the rudiment in, there'd be the goal, and the goal usually appeared in the first 150 goals that the pc had given you. And the terminal usually appeared in some similar number.

Now, you don't have to find the terminal now that way. But that goal, finding that first goal, requires just that same amount of technology. It requires that accuracy. It requires the effectiveness and efficiency necessary to make the pc just sit there and deliver. And you get the pc's goal. Now, that is the toughest hump of Routine 3D, is finding the pc's goal.

And when you're over that hump, you are on easy street because your next foremost action... It's unfortunate, you see, that we couldn't have it first. You see, why can't we have the opposition before we get the goal? Well, maybe it'd work out, but I haven't done any research in that particular line. And I think all we'd do is key the person in with a thousand motivators is my first idea of it.

I know we can do this other and we've got this thing taped and that that goal is accurate.

Our next immediate step is to find the opposition terminal. Now, this explains a great deal. Auditors floundering around here and there, auditors looking for somebody's terminal have here and there assessed the opposition terminal as the pc's terminal. Very interesting. And there was no preventive for knowing that we really did have the pc's goal and not an opposition goal of some kind or another. That has come up, too.

The auditor has failed to say, "Is that something you, you know, you, y-o-u . . sitting there in that head . . is that something that you ever wanted to do?" . . has just neglected that little tiny part in doing the Goals Assessment. Assessing things the pc really wanted to do and not having met that part, they put down just things that appear to the pc. And the pc can have these implant goals and things like that appear to him, you know, and they just sort of appear out of the blue sky, you know, in front of their face. They suddenly see this.

They get out of bed in the morning . . this actually happened . . get out of bed in the morning and they sort of see it printed on the ceiling so they know what it is.

Not anything they really wanted to do; it's just something that occurred to them. And, of course, somebody . . they come back, and that naturally assesses as a goal. It assesses as a goal because it simply assesses. It's all choked in there one way or the other as part of some implant.

Now, you remember that in Problems Intensive, which you all went through and I appreciate your cooperation on that because we really got that one whipped out. And you know that Central Orgs are getting marvelous results with this thing right now. They're doing marvelously with it.

We were just looking over stacks of stuff upstairs up there. And I'd say, for something new . . brassy new in their hands, to do this well with it was marvelous. We notice you aren't doing these. That's

because it's merely a key-out. It's a short look. It makes a person happier. It changes their profile. It just does better than anything we've ever had, but it doesn't clear them.

Now, if you noticed there, "a self-determined change" and "don't run the problem" were the two things that we learned at once when you started doing Problems Intensives. Self-determined change. That's all you must list. You mustn't ever list anything but a self-determined change.

The person decided to change and that's all we want because if we take "what changed your life," the person gives us his appendectomy, his tonsillectomy and so forth, and of course they assess his engrams because they are engrams.

We want the highest powered change, not the highest powered engram the person has. And they're making that mistake right out there in various parts of the world right this minute. They're assessing anything but the selfdetermined change. So that mistake can be made on a 3D, too. You can get a list of things that the pc had never wanted to do but that the pc is simply upset about. And then, of course, you don't get the pc's goal because it isn't on the list.

But this will occur to you as you go along . . and you will be fascinated with this in running 3D . . that the pc's goal, the opposition terminal, the opposition goal, the pc's modifier, the goal's terminal which is the terminal for G plus M and the Prehav level will all read exactly alike on their needle action. They will all read exactly alike. That's not necessarily true in patching up a case. He's got his goal almost gone on Routine 3. We've got that almost out. And all we need are the other parts, you see, to blow the thing completely.

Well, you'll have the goal, see, going kind of tick, you know . . a very sick sort of tick. You know? And the original needle action of that particular goal was a rock slam a half a dial wide, you see.

So you get this little tiny tick on the goal "I want to grow apple trees," you see, and you get this "tick." And then you find the opposition terminal to it, which is "termites" or something And you get "termites," and you get a half dial wide rock slam, see. It's never been touched. It's sitting there virgin. Pong!

And you get this bluthu-bong-bong-bong-bong-bong! And you get down and you get the opposition goal: "termites, to gnaw; to gnaw everyone." Something like that. And you get this opposition goal. And it's going bang, half a dial wide. You see crash, crash, crash! It's all registering like the original goal, you see.

You get back in there, you find the modifier, and there that goal goes with a very sick little tick, see? And we find the modifier: "and to never be audited right" . . "to grow apple trees and never be audited right." And we get a half dial wide rock slam on "never to be audited right." And for a moment the goal just reads gorgeously; it's just the most gorgeous reads you ever saw. And you say with a huge sigh of relief, you say, "Well, we finally got the goal back in." And then we read the modifier and then we look back at the goal and it's going with a very sick tick.

Then we go and try to find the rest of the parts and we try to assess something and we can't find a rock slam anymore. And we go back and there's no sick tick left. That's it. We just blew the rest of the goal. But there was that part of the goal lasting.

Now, this is why, you heard me a few . . not too many . . days ago making a crack . . I should never make a crack at Clears, but I made a crack . . I'd said, "Well, a Clear is a First Dynamic Clear. And you want to know why they act a little bit self-centeredly? That's why."

Do you realize that sitting on every one of those cases to clear up the rest of the dynamic, although the needle is floating, although the person's in perfect good shape and still stable, is all the rest of these parts? They're still there on that case. We're pretty damn clever to get around them that far and have the person walking straight up.

But where the Clear got cleared, got a perfectly free needle, everything was gorgeous, they were in wonderful shape and walked outside and the bank caved in on them . . what was it? It was just the

modifier or some other undisclosed part, and then they didn't quite know what had happened. Well, what does it take to straighten them out? Well, just run them through 3D on each one of their goals and these things will go boom! boom! blow! blow! blow! blow! boom! boom! out, out, out, out, out, out and they'll come up to Dynamic Clear. But you got to go through all the steps of 3D with them.

Whether you ever get a chance to audit anything on them or not . . like on the Prehav Scale . . that's beside the point. Because there are just these little tag ends still hidden in the bank. When you get those things out, then they go up there.

Now, the reason I've used the word Dynamic Clear is simply to bring up that point, not to make Clears feel that they're dynamic people. Just to bring up that one point: Yes, a Clear will be Clear on the first dynamic and can be cleared on the first dynamic, and he'll stay with a free floating needle and be in a bit of a games condition on the remaining dynamics; and that this is a hardship on one and all. The guy is now much more able to shoot you in the eye with skyrockets, you see.

Supposing the first goal that the Clear had was to climb the Eiffel Tower. And somebody ran that and they got a mountaineer or something, you see, and they ran that and the rest of it and it cleared all the way through it and everything else. Still sitting there is the modifier at least, you see, which is "to fire off skyrockets down at them and kill them all." Interesting thing to omit on a case, isn't it?

So you see where this is now. You see about where we're sitting. But this is a different type of Clear that we're making here because we're trying to clear this person up on all dynamics. And you'll find as you go through that they will clear up on all dynamics. That works out as an automaticity. Because you go back and start reaching for earlier, earlier goals and all that sort of thing and you'll start picking up the aberrations on the other dynamics and you'll get them worked out. These things will show up more rapidly.

All right. So much for the background music on the thing Your hardest point is finding the pc's goal. And that must be done with very perfect auditing, and it must be done with all rudiments in and the various laws of finding goals completely unchanged. And oddly enough, those same laws that govern the finding of goals govern the finding of every one of these parts. So actually you're not doing anything new at all. You're just using the same technology to find a different part. You learn the technology of finding a goal, of course, you can always find the technology of finding an opposition terminal and so on.

There's two exceptions to that in here. There's two exceptions: is (1) the modifier doesn't come down to just one phrase. You'll find that two or three phrases may stay in the list and you do a jigsaw puzzle with them and all of a sudden they're the modifier. Makes sense to the pc and clang, you've got the modifier.

The next point that isn't quite exactly the same as your other assessment actions is that the pc . . the more you find, the less the pc ARC breaks. So progressive discoveries on the assessment make an easier assessment, each one.

In other words, you're assessing more easily. Once you've got the center pin, the goal, to assess from there on, you'll find much more . . much simpler.

Now, but you just go on hammering and pounding these things out and you just do an assessment. Now, all of you are getting some security on the subject of assessing I found out that you can assess, that you do a good job of assessment, that you're occasionally knuckleheaded as hell but you can all overcome it. And then you smarten up and everything straightens out and so forth.

But you aren't having, really, a hard job doing an assessment. So I feel very secure in being able to teach that particular process and people to do it well. You have some command of your TRs and Model Session and reading the meter and know how to keep your rudiments in and know the activities connected with doing an exact assessment, and you won't have any trouble with it. Those things, known, are resulting in a rather easy discovery of goals.

Now, to get an opposition assessment is done the same way. And to get your opposition goal; well, that's done the same way. And to get your modifiers; done the same way. And to get a terminal from the pc's

goal terminal plus modifier is done the same way. And your Prehav Scale is a specialized type of assessment, but it's done just as it always has been done.

So although you may look at this as a formidable new package of stuff. "Oh, my God, what has he done to us now?" Oh, pages of it, you know. I've just shown you how you can cut about 80 percent of the charge . . about 80 percent of the charge . . off a goal before you ever run it.

So the time invested on assessment is enormously beneficial because it subtracts something on the order of four or five to one off of the final runs. In other words, one hour spent on this 3D assessment is worth maybe five and may be worth much more in terms of hours on the final run, so it's all . . it all cuts your time back.

Now, assessment can be done rapidly. Assessment should not be done slowly and pokily and sticking your feet in the mud, and so forth. Assessment is something could be done . . one right after the other. Bang! If you just really know that a pc will read . . . If a pc's rudiments are in and you say it, your instant read occurs after you've said whatever the items is that you're checking The instant read occurs, bang! right there. And you don't have to sit around and wait for it. And the pc doesn't have to say anything.

And your rudiments stay in . . you know, you can just do an assessment on almost a machine gun basis. It's the fastest thing you ever cared to look at . . doing an assessment.

So these assessments are backed up by the fact that at fir9t it may look to you, because it takes so long It takes maybe twelve, twenty-five hours to find a pc's goal. Then the remainder of this may look to you as being equally lengthy. But it isn't equally lengthy. And the more assessments you do. the shorter length of time it does. So, now the assessment becomes this important and so forth . . well, we can analyze and break it down and teach you to do assessments on a brrrrrrt basis, you see.

As a matter of fact, I wrote most of you notes in your pc's folders on how to do a rapid assessment. Aw, I can just state those very briefly right now. Just bang!

1. Get your rudiments in.

2. I don't care if you have a list already in existence before the session began or you have no list at all. Whatever list you were working with or obtain, you then . . . Of course, you don't have to attain a list on an E-Meter. You're just saying, "Well, what would. . .?" and so forth. Well, don't bother. Don't necessarily make him lay down the cans, but you're not paying any attention to the E-Meter. You just write the list down, you know. Cats, kings, coal heavers, you know. Just bang, bang, bang, bang, write it down, number them. Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang. You don't have to read anything.

And you can note tone arm occasionally and find out if tone arm is wobbling. But that's just a cross-check. If you're on the right track, you got to get a little tone arm motion while the person's assessing. All right. And you bleed that list down, with the meter sensitivity cranked all the way up to the top. And you ask some very pertinent question like, "Are there any more terminals that you feel would oppose growing apple trees?" And remember that growing apple trees is going to react on the meter, so you've got to be smart enough to get your reading off "Are there any more terminals?" No instant read after this . . there aren't any more. And that is it. You see? You bleed that meter down.

And you add without argument anything the pc wants to put on the cotton-picking list. No chin-chin about it. Halfway through the assessment and read off, the pc all of a sudden says, "Ooooh. Oooooh. A coal heaver. Oh, yes, yes. We were looking for heavy men, who handle shovels. A coal heaver. I just had this terrific cognition. Yes, a coal heaver."

Well, don't shut him up. It's just . . you're halfway through the assessment . . . There are two schools of thought on this. Either one is right. Add it to the bottom of the list to be checked later or add it right under what you were just adding. But of course, it goes out of number if you add it right on after what you're just assessing But the more stylized one, the more perfect one is to write it down at the bottom of the list

and give it a number. That's all. As much as that. It's those he adds on. Anything he wants to add on any time, let him add it to anything We don't care what it is and we don't care when he wants us to add it in.

We're halfway through rudiments and he thinks of another goal. Well, write the goal down and go on with what you're doing there, you see. Never argue with a pc as to what's going to be written down. There's another preventer in here about this, by the way. If the pc in giving you (quote) goals (unquote) is only giving you difficulties, "to get rid of my lumbago," "to get rid of my skull," "to get rid of my stomach," "to get over this terrible feeling that every time I see a cat it's going to jump through my right ear and out through my left ear," and so forth.

All right. Write them down. By all means, write them down, but write them down on a processing goal list. The pc won't object to this. You say, "Well, all right, that's . . ." You write it down, processing goal. You say, "We're interested in goals in life and livingness, you know. Look at all these difficulties. There we are in processing, see, and so on. We write that down . . when we come to audit, we'll take that up."

The pc is perfectly happy about it . . as long as you write it down! The only thing a pc blows up about is you just won't accept his goal. So if you have to split it out here with five lists finally because amongst the opposition terminals he's given you is all the friends he has and all the enemies he has, and it's just a total confused mishmash and so forth, well, write it all down, but not necessarily on the opposition terminal list. That's a good rule, see, because it keeps the pc from getting busted up, ARC broke, see. All right.

The next thing you do is you get that list complete so that there's no additional falls on it. Now, one of the ways of completing a goals list, of course, and a standard way . . the standard way of completing a goals list . . is to add secret goals, withheld goals, antisocial goals, unworthy goals, discreditable goals, that sort of thing. You know, you're used to asking for all those things.

Well, now remember that on these other parts we also have unworthy things and discreditable things that the pc doesn't want to have there. A person says, "Well, here's this list and there's five . . yeah, there's five opposition terminals." Five opposition terminals, huh? Early in the case? Five opposition terminals? Oh, no!

You ask him, "Any more terminals that would oppose this goal?" and so on.

No, no. Actually you don't get much of a fall on the meter either. You have to ask for unworthy opponents or opponents it would be unworthy to oppose. And opponents that would be discreditable to fight. Hu-hu-hu-hu. You find this hulking brute of a man has as his opposition terminal, a baby. He very possibly will never come up with it and tell it to you because it's just not worthwhile. You get some fellow who's very upset on the subject of wives because he kept burying them and shoving them into vaults where other people were already buried. And that sort of thing Well, a wife isn't a proper opposition terminal, see? But it is. And you've got to point it out by asking unworthy, discreditable, so forth, goals.

So you shake all these things down on that type of nomenclature. In other words, you don't only get your antisocial goals, you see, sort of thing as the additional type, you see. You get the unworthy or discreditable opposition terminal.

You don't get an antisocial opposition terminal because the pc will tell you they're all antisocial. Ministers? Everybody knows that they're the most antisocial people alive, and so forth. They're all antisocial terminals to the pc, you see. So that you're wasting your time asking for an antisocial opposition terminal. That's silly. They're all antisocial. To some degree or another, they're destructive. Let me put it that way.

Now, we come down the line here and we find the opposition terminals the pc lists, or goal or any other type of assessment. We've got to get the list complete. We've got to make sure that there's nothing he's dodging We've got to use any kind of wording necessary to make sure that he has understood exactly

what we are doing and what we exactly want and we watch the meter, and we make sure that that whole list is bled.

That meter is just bled of any reaction on the subject of another terminal. We want the instant read on another terminal, not on a repetition of the goal. That's about the only thing that's going to get in the road of somebody. Of course, every time you say the pc's goal, you get a reaction on the needle. Every time you say the pc's modifier, you're going to get a reaction on the needle. Well, don't get it all mixed up with what you're asking for.

Learn to ask for what you want. You say, "Now, on this goal to grow apple trees . . ." Of course, you're going to get a reaction. It's perfectly all right for you to say that, don't you see.

"Now, on this goal to grow apple trees, is there anybody else who would oppose it?" Bang! Well, who was that? See.

Well, of course, that "oppose apple trees," let us say, had a little rock slam. And when you say, "Now, on this goal to oppose apple trees," and you're liable to get a little rock slam there, you see. Because every time you repeat the goal, you get a reaction on the needle. You know that, so you don't pay any attention to that. And you just say, "Are there any more terminals that would oppose it?" Oh, pang, see. You get your instant read on the question you want.

Learn to read a meter instantly on the basis of what you want to know. And you learn to stress the word that you want to know and get your reading only on those words. If you're very clever, you can actually read a meter this way. "Now, what would oppose wanting to grow apple trees?" Well, you know darn well you're going to get a rock slam on wanting to grow apple trees . . but right there. "What would oppose. . ." you get your instant read right there. See? Actually, take an interim, middle of the sentence read.

"What would oppose wanting to grow apple trees?" Of course, you're going to get a rock slam over here as soon as you say, "want to get apple trees," see. Naturally. But you just take your read right out of the middle of the sentence. You see how clever you can get on that?

All right. Now, having completed your list utterly, you get the rudiments in. And while completing the list if the pc is upset, you get your rudiments in. But you certainly get your rudiments in at sensitivity 16. Cranked way up. And you really get those rudiments in. Bang! And then you take the thing down to a one dial drop, because that's all you'd want for an assessment. It's too crazy trying to assess with your sensitivity knob too high. Oh, man, it's just all over the place, particularly if some guy's had a lot of auditing, you know. His needle's very loose anyhow. At zero it's a one dial drop. What do you think it will read like? What do you think mine reads like every now and then?

I mean, somebody'll turn it up here to sensitivity 16 and I breathe, you know. Breaks the pin on both sides. You can't read it, see. So you want a one dial drop if you can possibly manage to get that. And then with a one dial drop, you take your long feathered plumed pen in hand . . nib already sharpened; you'll . . no more delays there, see . . and you go straight down the list. You say, "Now we're going to assess this list . . ." or you can say, "Is it all right with you if we assess this list?" And you go right down the list.

And you read three times. Bang! Bang! Bang! Now, I found out that it doesn't much matter whether you read and acknowledge and read and acknowledge and read and acknowledge, or read, read, read and acknowledge. It doesn't much matter which one you do. But in view of the fact that, with technical perfection, each one i8 a theoretical question, see. Even though you have just said the terminal, you have theoretically asked the pc a question like "Is this it?" See? Only you haven't said, "Is this it?" You've just said the item. But theoretically that registers as, "Is this it?" see. "Is apple tree it?" You know?

And I suppose with total perfection you could lay it down as a bit of a rule that every time you said one you acknowledged the pc and then nobody's going to get mixed up.

All right. And you just say it and acknowledge, say it and acknowledge, say it and acknowledge. Just about that fast.

´Soldier. Soldier. Soldier," see, would be the spacings necessary to read it.

So, if you fill the interim in with the acknowledgment it sounds like one straight line. You say, "Soldier. Thank you. Soldier. Thank you. Soldier. Thank you." It doesn't sound like there's any pause there, but of course "Thank you" is not going to get a reaction, but "soldier" is. So the instant read is going into your acknowledgment.

Now, you read all of these things off while looking at the meter. Now, total perfection requires that you lift your eyes from the meter to the pc when you give the acknowledgment. But factually speaking, to the pc to really know whether or not he's being acknowledged, you would have to be in the action of lifting your eyes while you were saying "ank" in order to have caught the instant read before you did so.

In other words, don't go so goofy on this one that you miss your instant reads just to be looking at the pc. You got it?

When you get this real down pat, you'll flick your eyes at the pc or lift your head and say, "Thank you" to the pc directly every time, see. Even though you're picking it up on the meter, you're saying it to the pc.

Now, the funny part of it is, is the pc . . your eyes aren't necessarily necessary in order to convey the "thank you" to the pc. And it's not really necessary to go through a lot of gymnastics on this sort of thing I'm just trying to lay it down so you get a picture of how it looks.

If you can get three repeats of the item in, a thorough acknowledgment to the pc and tell the pc whether it is still in or is now out, and go on to the next one and do the same thing without entering into chitchat, oddities, or anything else or discussion with the pc, and with no time being lost in the middle, I will be very happy with you. If you can get that far, I'll be very happy with you.

What does that look and sound like? It sounds like something on this order: "Soldier. Soldier. Soldier. Thank you. That's still in.

"Woman. Woman. Woman. Thank you. That's out.

"George. George. George. Thank you. Still in."

Now, I can assess faster than that. If you run it that fast, you've got it made in the shade.

Now, you tell the pc at the beginning, "You don't have to say anything" The pc can just sit there in the most gorgeous state of irresponsibility, as Mary Sue raised it less elegantly once. And the whole assessment's perfectly accurate. Pc doesn't have to say anything.

Pc in the middle of your saying "Soldier. Soldier" . . . pc says, "I just thought of another one. 'Gargantua'. "

Well, that's all right. That's fine. Good. You got another one. Write it down here on the end of the list, and go back and say, "All right. Thank you. Soldier. Soldier. Soldier. Thank you. Still in." Got the idea?

Now, you get assessing down to this type of a basis, and you're not doing twenty questions a session. You're doing something on the order of a hundred an hour. That sounds a little bit different in the same lick of speed.

Well, all right. As long as we're going to do this much assessing, we might as well learn the most optimum, swift, accurate method of assessment.

Now, why only three times? Well, frankly, if you go over the list more often, you will find out that the number of times you've had to repeat is lessened. Going over the whole list and coming back to the

beginning again scrubs more terminals than going . . or goals or items . . than trying to serub one out eight or nine times apiece.

We had a slightly different system we used earlier. If after three times it seemed like it was staying in, we went ahead and scrubbed it out. For an actual test, this isn't necessarily useful. You just give it three times, it's still in, and go on to the next one . . yes, it'll leave an awful lot of marks down the line that apparently are still in and still live, but you'd be surprised how many of those will disappear on the next pass over. Because in-going over the list, you haven't permitted then the pc to sink back on the track.

The pc is still with you, and the pc is still . . is as-ising more rapidly because the pc hasn't been driven into a point of the track. And restimulating chronic somatics and that sort of thing . . which was a liability to the other type of assessing . . is avoided. You never repeat him back into the middle of the operation and then try to go on to the next level. Hu-hu-hu. Try that sometime.

"Tonsillectomy, tonsillectomy. What did the doctor say during the tonsillectomy? Hold still. All right. Hold still. Hold still. Hold still. Hold still. Hold still. Hold still. Hold still. Hold still. It isn't it. It isn't out yet. Hold still. Hold still. Hold still. Hold still. Ho well, it finally disappeared. All right. Hold still. Yeah, it's not there now. All right. Now, we're going on to the next item on this particular list," and the pc's sitting there, you know . . . You can repeat him right back into the incident.

So once . . thrice over lightly you'll find holds good.

Now, there's something else that I'd call your attention thereto: that it's an equality. I don't care if you speak these things forcefully, lightly or otherwise, as long as they reach the pc with clarity.

If you vary from terminal to terminal or item to item, your volume and expression, you'll throw the assessment somewhat. You have decided, for instance, it's "Gargantua," you see.

And you get down . . you say, "Apple tree. Apple tree. Apple tree. Well, that's out. Gargantua! Gargantua! Gargantua! Well, that's certainly in. All right. Well, well come back to that 'Gargantua' later because that looks awfully hot."

And on an exaggerated basis, you can throw an assessment by doing just that.

Now, you're . . as you tear down the line, you get this item . . this is your next step in assessing . . you get the item, whatever it is, isolated. It's the only one left in that's reacting Now get your rudiments in at sensitivity 16 and check it against the dead items that you've already killed. You just read three or four at random off the list and read this item, and three or four at random off the list and read this item you found, you see. The found item. And read three or four more nulls off the list and you'll find this found item.

Don't be too surprised if there's a slight kick still left in some of the things that you thought were null. Because the funny thing is, as you balance the whole terminal line out, some things will fall out and then momentarily fall back in. Don't worry about that if it does that. Just start worrying about it if what you found falls out. It's somewhere else; it's something else if something starts going in and out on you that way, because they hold it.

All right. Now, having found the thing and checked the thing, you now check another point. Let us say it's the third item you've found here. You realize now you've got to say the goal and note its reaction, the opposition terminal and note its reaction. And let's say you were working on the modifier . . or the opposition goal . . and say the opposition goal. And now you'll find out that if one did a kind of a Stage Four piece of nonsense, then the next one'll do the same piece of nonsense, and the next one will do the same piece of nonsense. And the whole assessment will fall exactly alike. It's quite interesting. But the whole assessment . . every item on the assessment will fall alike.

Now, that is not a final test. You should not throw everything away just because this doesn't happen. Because it is not a final test. You get your ARC up and get the roughness off the session and they will all fall alike, but sometimes a roughness at some part of a session will cause one to go a little bit zzzzz.

And you'll notice this. What you want to worry about is that the opposition terminal is different than the goal and all the rest of the list.

Well, but the goal . . you're getting the Prehav that falls the same as the goal, and you're getting the goal plus modifier terminal, that falls the same as the goal. And everything falls the same as the goal, but the opposition terminal. If you check it over, you find out that the pc himself got an ARC break along about that time, and he's kind of hung up, and it's half pushed out. The second you straighten out, this could come back right in and read the same as everything else, you see, without changing it.

So you see, other things than wrong assessment can make these things go a little bit haywire. But when you've got everything straightened out and all rudiments completely in and all roughness off assessment and any upsets and so forth off, they all actually ought to read alike. It's just a complete parade. That's a perfect textbook solution is the goal and the opposition terminal and the opposition goal and the pc's goal modifier and the pc's goal terminal, and the first level of the Prehav assessed . . it's just a bunch of little martinet soldiers. They all read ee-bong, ping-pong. They all do exactly the same read on the meter. They all make the needle do exactly the same thing. Why? They're all part of the same package. They're all locked up together. If one of them is terribly different, it's not part of the same package.

Now, what you want to be aware of in that last checkout is that your goal assesses fine, and then your opposition terminal assesses the same as the goal. And then the opposition goal doesn't assess the same. And the modifier doesn't assess the same. And the goals plus modifier terminal doesn't assess the same. The Prehav level assesses so . . . What's this?

Well, it means that where they started assessing differently, you got the wrong one. It's the first one that has the different reaction. And the safest thing to do is to go back and do the whole thing from the point where it doesn't get the same reaction. Because they will go further and further out from the wrong one, see. You wind up nowhere. And that is one of the preventions. This checkout is one of the preventions from running a wrong goal or something like that. It's a prevention. It doesn't so much prevent running the wrong goal, but it certainly prevents running the rest of it.

If you can't get anything to agree with anything on the whole case, you'd better do another Goals Assessment and make sure you had the right goal in the first place because that's the one that'll be out. Nothing falls with it.

Now, when you're doing this cross-checking, invalidation is one of the grimmest things that you can do. But next to that is suggesting. And just never suggest anything to a pc, please. Don't, don't. It's gotten more and more important that we didn't ever suggest anything to the pc. We can have all our own opinions we want to. We can talk these things over with the pc. But we must never suggest anything to the pc. Just nothing Never suggest a thing The pc says, "Well, don't you think maybe that to . . . Don't you think maybe uh . . . ducklings would be a very good opposition on this? Duckling Can you think of something like ducklings?"

And you say, "You're getting there. What is it?" Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Give him encouragement. Always give him encouragement. Never give him any suggestions. Because you could do yourself more throat cutting and you could mess yourself up more by suggesting an item or two or even seeming to for the pc than any other single way you can do it.

Unless, of course, it's permitting the pc to sell you an item the pc is fond o£ If you don't think people learn to do this early, a nine-year-old the other day was able to sell a wrong goal and wrong terminal to an experienced auditor. Isn't that fascinating? A nine-year-old pc sold a wrong goal and a wrong terminal to an experienced auditor. Sold them.

They were just wildly out. But the nine-year-old decided that would be a nice goal to have and that would be a nice terminal to have so, every time came past it, had a little tiny physical convulsion that threw the meter.

So next... First, there's invalidation. That's just out. We don't even pay. . . This couldn't happen. And then there's suggesting things to the pc. That's a nice big crime. And then there's this next crime, is buying things the pc is selling We're using sell in the category of having a body convulsion, twitching the little finger. Suddenly finding out that they can get a registry if they suddenly pull their skin tight across their face, suddenly.

"Well, every time you hit that terminal, it makes me pull this surface across my face!" you see. And of course, the E-Meter will get a reaction. You say, "Well, we're going to check that out without you doing that."

"Oh, but it's impossible. It always does that."

You say, "Well, it may be impossible, but just look around the room for a moment. Now, look at the ceiling Now, look at the floor. Now, look at this. Now, look at that."

"Bingo!" That was the terminal, see . . "bingo." The person will say . . belatedly, you know . . "Ah, he missed." "Wasn't able to make it that time." A little bit late.

It's a real stupid auditor that will buy a "sell" of this character. That's real stupid because everything then will go out and nothing will check. Now, it's an awfully good thing that when you've found a part to get it checked by somebody. As you get more experienced, find a package and get it checked by somebody.

All right. Now, I should tell you perhaps a few words on what all these things are, but you will find them defined in this unnumbered bulletin. You'll find them all defined at the back of the stuff of what all these things are and so forth. And I don't think I would do you any too much good giving you any more data than you have right in this first page 4, Routine 3D. I think that's quite adequate to the definitions which are on that.

But let me tell you something The whole theory of it is simply this. It's very easy to sum up its theory.

Observation: The pc's goals are so easily invalidated, they disappear and can't be assessed.

All right. Now, that's an observation. Now, you've got good reality on that one.

All right. What's making this happen? It isn't because the auditor's mean. Because I know you; you're not mean. A few trillennia ago when you were making a specialty out of burning young girls, you had some aberrations alive then, but you've recovered from it. You're not that mean anymore.

How come? How come this is so uniform? Well, it obviously must be that the thing has an opposition built into it that is easily triggered.

Well, what is it? There must be a part in there someplace. And then how come this goal . . now that we've learned problems will last forever on the track because they're postulate-counter-postulate and therefore become timeless . . what is this goal (if it is timeless, which it obviously is), what is it but a postulate-counter-postulate, terminal-counter-terminal situation. That must be what a goal is. And the goal is the little tag that is visible, but there must be some other parts of it which are missing, which is what opposes the goal, how come it's hung up in the mind.

You see, if you know the anatomy of problems, you know the fellow has a goal, he wants to get something done. And it's right there as one little package and so forth.

Well, you're crediting this fellow with the extraordinary ability to hold onto this determinism without some mechanical assistance for the last sixteen trillennia. You know? I mean, there it is.

What's it up against? Anything? Nothing There's nothing out in front of it at all. There's nothing out in front of this goal to hold it there. Does that seem reasonable? No, it isn't reasonable at all. And by George, there is something out in front of the goal.

All right. So it's a package which composed of. . . The pc's goal is quite visible because that's usually . . even though it's to be a first-class prostitute or something . . it's quite socially acceptable. Human beings would recognize this as a goal.

See, it's something that can be remarked on. You could mention that. And that's all that's in view. Well, that's all that's available, really. "Oh, yes, well, I wanted to be a . . wanted to be a big boy when I was young"

Quite socially acceptable, isn't it?

Of course, when we get the parts, we find it wasn't quite so socially acceptable, but so far so good. We've got to be a big boy.

All right. What's this opposed against? Well, it's opposed against an idea. But let me tell you that the idea is, I think, more difficult to find than the terminal. It's easier to find the terminal and then find the idea than it is to find the idea and then the terminal. The most available thing there is the terminal, so we find the opposition terminal to the goal. Ah, but it's an opposition terminal to the goal, see, we're finding it criss-crossed, see.

So here's this thing: "To be a big boy." "Well, who would oppose your being a big boy?" Not necessarily . . this is kind of poor nomenclature. Poor to keep using "your goal" and phrases of this kind where you're asking the person. Why not just ask the person. Well, you found his goal. It's not going to wear out. So you repeat it five thousand more times, and it does wear out. Well, that just clears him that much faster. So go ahead and use these parts. Go ahead and use them in your phraseology after you've found them.

And you say, "Who would oppose your being a big boy?"

"Bigger boys. Uh . . cats. Um . . fathers. Mothers."

Here we go on down the list, you see. "Who would oppose your being a big boy?" you know. And we get something pretty wild that fits exactly what the case is. And what would oppose his being a big boy, naturally, is machinery. That's what he says, and that's what it assesses out and it rocks the same as "to be a big boy" and here's "machinery." Ha-ha! Good. We've got the opposition terminal.

Now, let's find the opposition goal. All right. "What would be the idea of machinery?" Now, we get a lot of things.

"Well, the idea of machinery is to run wild and to make dog biscuits, and it's ideas and so forth."

And "Well, what would a . . what idea would it have there of opposing your goal to be a big boy? I mean, what idea would it have that would oppose your being a big boy and so forth?"

"Well, huh . . well as a matter of fact, that's cutting people to pieces."

Yeah, well, there's that one. And then there's "running wild," and "there's doing this and there's doing that." We assess it out, and it's "to cut people to pieces." Ah, well, we're getting very interested here.

All right. Now, we've got machine, and we've got its goal. We've got the goal of the machine. That isn't really the goal of the machinery at all. It's the goal that the pc thinks the machinery must have that directly opposes him.

So, so far we've got the pc's goal, we've got the opposition terminal, and now we got the opposition goal is "to cut people to pieces."

All right. Dandy.

Now, we've got to find the pc's goal modifier. And this was completely out of sight up to this time. But we've done all this assessment work, so actually we've eased up the weight of the invalidation just by bringing it to view, see. So now the modifier should show up far more easily because before we were going through a tough route to find it.

All right. Well, we've taken some weight off of this thing now. So the pc's goal modifier is "to be a big boy or go up in smoke trying and never come down again." Well, that's great. That's great. That's just fine.

Now, let's find what is the pc's goal plus modifier. Now, we want to know: "Who or what would want to be a big boy who would go up in smoke trying and never come down again?"

"Go up in smoke trying and never come down again. Would be a rocket operator. Yeah, and it'd be a horse jockey and a cat whisker and a lion tamer," see. And we get down the line. But all of a sudden we come back and it's "a rocket operator." It's "a rocket operator," all right; that's what we've got. And there it is. "Rocket operator." We've got it right there. And that's our goals terminal.

You'll find out the further you go on the assessment, the plainer the part gets. But out of this "to be a big boy," it sort of looked like we had school days, charm, everything was wonderful, going to be sweetness and light, isn't it cute, you see. And we get machinery and the machinery's going to cut you to pieces and so forth. And it starts looking peculiar, doesn't it? And naturally, all of this is directing us straight in toward the Goals Assessment. And frankly, if you can do an expert job of assessment, drdrrrrrr, ta-tat-ta-ta-tat ta-ta-tat-ta-ta, just sit there, get the rudiments in, get the thing, get the list written, get the rudiments in, assess the list, brrrrrrrrrr and on down the line; you're going to find out that after you've got the first goal, that finding the rest of the thing is just a lead-pipe cinch.

It all depends on how many times you say, "Ah," how many times you say "Er," how many times you sigh and how much space you leave between items. And that's all it amounts to because nobody's going to say that you must put the rudiments in rapidly. Don't think that is necessary.

I say put the rudiments in effectively. If it takes you awhile to get in rudiments, all right, 80 it takes you a while to get in rudiments. Nobody's going to argue with you about putting in rudiments or time consumed thereon. But I am going to argue with you about "soldier" or "rocket operator." "Mmmmm. How do you feel about that? Hm-mm. Meter's a little bit out of adjustment here. Yeah. All right. Well, here we go. Here it is again. Rocket operator. Hm. Yeah. Mm-hm. Rocket operator. Well, okay. That still seems to be in." Of course, it's not doing anything in the world but falling on an ARC break by this time.

Now, I want you to be able to say: "Rocket operator. Rocket operator. Rocket operator. Thank you. Still in. Soldier. Soldier. Soldier." Get the idea? And boy, can you chew up lists. You would just be fascinated.

Then your assessment is simply boiled down to the speed you can write because that's the lengthiest activity . . would just be the activity necessary in simply writing down the terminals which are given. Nobody's going to say that this is a school in penmanship, and we teach you how to write fast. Just get over all those times you wrote the billet-doux to the wrong man's wife and get over those times when you signed those warrants for execution and you'll find out your ss . . goes up terrifically . . speed just goes right up.

All right. Now, I'm going to have to give you more talks on this because we have the whole subject of commands and so forth to go into. But so far as you're concerned, the reason you find all these parts is to make it easier to find in each case the next part with greater accuracy.

Now, that's reason enough for you to find all of the parts, strangely enough.

And later on, after you've run the first terminal or so, you know, off the Prehav Scale, and you're on to your next Goals Assessment, you're going to find you're going to have to get to the Prehav Scale and run that one probably. And then your next one. And all of a sudden, just the finding of these parts goes in a

sort of an endless circle. You find the parts, you find a goal and you get it down the line as far as you can get it. And go back and check it and it all fits. And what this basically is best at, this particular thing, besides making things easier, is that it gives you the consecutive release of goals . . occurs much more rapidly. So there's, of course, enormous amounts of time saved toward the end of clearing This hasn't either that . . too much to do with it; you're going to clear a lot more people in this particular way.

Now, how are you going to miss clearing people? You're going to miss clearing people by doing a bad technical job or by not auditing them or by not taking enough time with somebody to find all the parts correctly and so forth and putting it all together and hanging the thing right. That's about what the thing amounts to.

And we already know that if you find the goal and if you find the terminal that matches that goal and it doesn't beef up the Prehav Scale and you run that on many levels of the Prehav Scale and it goes down, down and disappears out of sight . . and that a lot of people go Clear on this if it's done enough and if it was accurately enough done in the first place.

But there's nothing that guarantees the accuracy of the fir8t job. There is nothing that takes care of a lot of little missing odds and ends of parts. The pc stays very . . remains very hard to keep in-session to a marked degree. And so you get a small percentage of people going Clear on that particular procedure. Now, this one, you've got all the parts that could make any difference to the thing. Exactly how you speed it up from there depends entirely on the form of the command and if anything can be done with speeding up the actual commands. We could just go on and run these terminals as found on the Prehav Scale, and all would be lovely. We could go ahead and clear that way. And I'm trying to find out right now if there isn't a faster way to beef up that particular formation of commands than we've had to speed it up even more. Because it now lies in the lap of effective commands. The more effective the command is, well, the faster clearing will occur. Okay?

All right. Well, you've got the package there. I'm sorry to dump it on your lap so unannouncedly but I would say, after looking it over last night, that most of you had weathered the storm very, very well, and you are to be congratulated on it. You recognize that some of the goals are quite null and it's going to take a little while to finish off that particular goal, but it'll finish off more or less by assessment. And then you'll be out in the clear and onto a new level.

Actually, some of you don't realize it, but you're very, very close to the point of having the first goal-terminal combination flat right this moment. So you're starting in with Routine 3D the hard way. Very short way; but it's the hard way because you'll be puzzled why things are disappearing and appearing and so forth.

And later on when a good, solidly aberrated case comes along, why, you will see it work much more smoothly than it's working right at this moment. So I don't think there's any lack of supply of that type of case just at the moment, so that's fine.

All right. Thank you very much. And I wish you lots of luck with it.

Audience: Thank you, Ron.