ROUTINE 3D (continued)

A lecture given on
15 November 1961

Well, as you can see, I walk in here, your case is in my hands. That's a joke. But not quite so much of a one as you might think.

All right. I suppose you are still in a gentlemanly and a ladylike frame of mind about 3D, and you are wrestling with it. A little later you'll be rassling with it. A little less ladylike perhaps.

The truths of the case is that there are some possible randomities in Routine 3D which could get you into various upsets. But what is this now? This is the 16th of November 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill, and we have under discussion Routine 3D.

Now, we still have some people around who want to know why are we finding an opposition terminal and all that sort of thing. Well, what broke down the whole thing was that a majority of people were not going Clear on Routine 3. Now, why weren't they? So I got a small pick and a shovel and began to go into skulls and then I got one of these widow-maker pavement breakers and started going in a little bit deep. And then got an oil well rig and really started going down two or three miles. And I finally found out that the length of time of clearing . . clearing would eventually happen . . but the length of time of clearing is in direct ratio to the dramatization of the modifier. I found a new piece here, the modifier.

Now, on people who clear fast, it accidentally runs out fast. And on people who are clearing very, very slowly at Lord knows how many hours, it was running out very slowly.

Now, what is this modifier? It is the threat the pc makes if he cannot obtain his goal. Covert character, this thetan, huh? He says, "Well," he said, "I'm going to build buildings." Isn't that sweet? That's nice, isn't it? That's real nice. You know, that's good. That's good. That's socially acceptable. Everything's fine.

And he says, "To build buildings." And everybody says, "Cheers, he's going to be a great engineer," you know. "A great construction man," and so on. And his tutors pat him on the head, and everything goes along swimmingly, and everything is marvelous. And you try to clear the fellow on this goal "to be a great engineer."

Well, what's your . . what . . this question should be asked. Why do we have to clear him on being a great engineer? This is obviously the sole virtue this character has. Yeah, let's ask that burning question. Why do we have to clear him on "to be a great engineer," huh? Aha. Aha. We twist the moustache at its long waxed ends and look down his throat, and what do we find? Well, I've said, "Well, it must be a problem because it's hanging up on the track. To be suspended on the track, this goal must then be suspended against something which is other-determined to it."

Ah, all right. I didn't look very far. But the first thing I found was this modifier. And that's the pc's, is "to be a great engineer, and if they don't applaud sufficiently when I put up buildings, to have them fall down and crush them into da street."

Now, for some weeks, I went around doing a background music study on this thing, and I was quite interested to find in all the works of man, every one of them has got a booby trap built into it.

You tell Homo sap to mow a lawn and it's all fine, but there's just something there, you see? It's not me being critical. It's the fact the lawn is too short or it's too long, or it isn't mowed around the fringes, or they stop the mower in the middle of the lawn and fill it with a gas can and spill some.

We say, well, it's just carelessness, you know. So you say to the fellow, "Well, now, the next time you mow the lawn, why, pull the lawn mower off to the side onto a path, and there fill it with the gas can. You see, and then you spill all you want to, see." And you come back next time, and the wheels of the

mower have been spinning in some fashion to cut large ruts across the best place. But he did do this other, you see, but there are these ruts in the lawn now.

Well, I've had a lot of experience with Homo sap. And of course, I've had to live with myself, too. That's taken some doing, believe me. It isn't everybody could have done that. But here we had this marvelous thing going on whereby if you don't quite watch it, why, there's going to be something built there, so the fifteenth step up the tower is not welded.

What are these things? And what are these things? And I asked myself that for a number of weeks. I went around and observed all these things, and so forth. I don't get up in some ivory tower because they're drafty, these ivory towers. It's much better to be out amongst the warmth of humanity if you're studying it. And it's a new thought, you know, in the whole field of philosophy, is go and look at what you're studying. A brand-new thought. Actually newer than you think.

So I couldn't find anything man was doing that he wasn't building a little problem into. And the worse he was off, the more problems he was building into what he was making or what he was doing. And this seemed to me to be very interesting. Well, now, this wasn't, to be very honest with you, bluntly and directly solved by the modifier. It wasn't just one, two, these two studies, one study resulted . . of man's errors- . . resulted in the other studies. It just happens I had been studying this for some weeks, which probably catalyzed my observation of these other things. What I found out was that pcs went downhill as they were clearing and then went uphill. And sometimes they went downhill for a long time, and then went uphill. But they always went downhill before they went uphill. Isn't that interesting?

Well, it violates the rules of early auditing You give somebody some auditing and he gets better, see? He doesn't get worse and then gets better. So we must have . . must be a bug in here someplace. What is this that has gotten around, and we find out on further observation that there was a reservation on the goal. In other words, whatever the person set out to do. he had a little bit of a reservation kicking around. Let's just put it that way. That's the mildest, most acceptable form of it. But it's worse than that.

You ask this person, "Now, you want to be a great engineer. All right. Very good. Now, what would be your answer to constant failure at this goal. What would you add to the goal if you continued to fail in it?" and so forth.

And the fellow will dream up some various odds and ends, and all of a sudden you'll get some that register on the meter.

Well, it's very interesting but it's almost unreachable, almost unreachable. You tried for a week. I could reach these things, but I reached them as a Dianetic auditor. Get the meter, repeater technique. Take the various words. Take the whole list. Take all the bouncers, denyers, call backs, and so forth, out of the entire list that they had already given you. Very interesting. This is quite a technique. Fortunately, I don't think you have to learn it. But it's quite a technique.

You ask them to list all of the things he would use to modify his goal if he continued to fail. He keeps giving you phrases and phrases and phrases and phrases. You finally got pages of phrases now. Then you just go through those. And one or two of you had red marks on the list. I gave you red checkmarks on the list and told you run these by repeater technique on the person, see, because they're in there someplace. He gave you someplace the modifier. But every time he gave you one of these bouncers or denyers or something like that, if it was even close to the modifier, he bounced out of the vicinity of the goal. And the goal read sporadically. Just that. He bounced on the track. He moved in relationship to the thing And you had to repeat him back into it. And if you were to directly find a modifier, you would have to master these old Dianetic techniques of getting, actually, the flash answer to the question. And you get the bouncers and make down lists of these things. Get the list off the pc. Bounce these things back in. Finally sort the thing out. And it actually was already taking you hours and hours and hours and hours and hours to do this. Why?

Well, you're doing it uphill. And if you did it badly, you would invalidate the pc's goal, and then of course the whole thing would go up in smoke.

All right. So I sought a better method of doing this, and ran into the rest of the picket fence. There it was. You see, the goal and the modifier are the pc's half of the idea. What's the other half of the idea and who had it?

Now we had to . . have to have two halves to make a problem. And the goal plus modifier is only one half. Now, that must be confronted by something of equal magnitude from an other-determinism to be a complete whole. Otherwise, it wouldn't hang on the track. You've got to have two forces in balance . . one against the other . . before you get something moving in time in the mind. That's one of the basic rules of it. As you learn problems, you see more and more problems, you'll find out that his problem is to have a happy home. It's not a goal now. It's just a problem. Problem: To have a happy home. And why can't he have a happy home? Well, there must be some other idea confronting it. Now the pc may give you that idea himself, and it may be apparently resident with the pc. But as we chase it back to try to find out where this problem is, he had somebody who was determined not to have a happy home. Let's be as elementary as possible on this thing This fellow had an idea that he ought to have a happy home. Not a goal to have one, just had the idea he ought to have one.

And he had this opposed idea of somebody shouldn't have one, shouldn't have one. We should have a dog's breakfast on Dog's Breakfast Street. There's two ideas, isn't it?

All right. Now, that is an anatomy of a problem, see? You've got one idea and the other fellow's got another idea, and the two ideas combined run head-on into each other in balance. And if they do that, they'll then drift through time.

Now, there must have been a confusion before that. When you get the confusion out from underneath this, you will find then that . . there's something else occurs that one or the other of these ideas unbalances, and this thing sort of misses each other. If you can get the idea of two sticks pushed against each other, they'll stay pushed against each other until you get below them and tap them with your thumbnail or something like that. And one stick will miss, and then these two things won't lock up anymore. And you don't have this same structure anymore.

Well, it takes these two sticks, one punched against the other to get a problem riding through time. That is why the problem rides through time. It's two ideas. It's an unresolvable situation of two ideas.

Now, a problem has this additional thing. The person says, "I want to be a successful wife," and at the same time has the other idea, "I want to go to lots of nightclubs and parties with other men."

And you'll find this in pcs all the time, and they'll come up with it, and that's what makes problems so weird. They come up with this idea, "Well, it's unsolvable, you see. It's unsolvable. My problem is unsolvable, you see."

And you get to drumming it up, and you finally find out that it gets stated on this basis that they want to be a wife and do that sort of thing "And why can't George," you see, "accept me as a successful wife," and all that sort of thing, you know.

And then you get to searching for it. They say, well, they also ought to be going out to nightclubs all the time with other men. And this is in the same pc, you see. And they've accepted one of these as their idea and then they accepted the other one as their idea.

But originally these were two ideas counter-opposed.

If you start plumbing up this problem on a Problems Intensive, you'll find out that there was somebody else around . . if you wanted to go this far . . insisting they go to nightclubs with other men while they were trying to be a successful wife.

Then these two ideas lock up, and they own both of them simultaneously, and you get a (quote) "unresolvable" problem. One of those ideas was the pc's and then one of them was a later valence.

The situation, then, is you get a lockup in time. And it appears to be what... How you miss it, you see, it appears to be simply the individual himself with two ideas, see? Isn't that what it looks like? He's got two ideas.

Now, if you separate these two ideas apart, you'll find one of these ideas belongs to the pc and the other idea belonged to somebody else. But actually, how did the pc own this first idea? It's usually through a valence mechanism. And the valence mechanism is a simple mechanism. He adopts the valence, and the valence has the idea. Now, the valence confronts another being, and that being has a different idea. And then the pc gets this valence locked on the first valence, and they're actually in apparent double valence situation. It's like concentric walnut shells, one right after the other.

You've got a walnut, and then you've got a shell outside the walnut. Now, if you can think of the thing of having a shell outside the walnut shell, and then a shell outside that walnut shell, and then a shell outside that . . .

You ever peel an onion? Well, that is actually the way a pc's bank or beingness looks. That is the way it looks. And that's why you cry when you . . when you . . .

Now, frankly, if we were to take this apart in an ordinary and routine fashion, it would be sort of like this. Your ordinary take apart would simply to be to peel the onion skin by skin, and boy, if you haven't got a gas mask, you can't do it. But it does take a long, long time, and it is very tough on the pc, and he gets gains, and he gets loses. And let's say he had a valence as a woman, and that the outer skin to the valence of the woman was the valence of a man. And you process off the valence of a man, and now your pc's acting like a woman. You peel off the next valence, the pc's acting like a child. You peel off the next valence, the pc's acting like a dog. What is this all about, don't you see?

Well, there are literally, literally . . well, it's some unimaginable figure. It's some astronomic-type mathematics would it take to get the figure, of how many valences are accumulated by the pc in actuality. And it's probably something on the order of . . oh, I don't know . . binary digits of some kind or another. It's way, way, way up there.

They accumulate as many as half a hundred in one lifetime. And times being tougher in some areas than the others, you say, well, the pc lives . . . Let's be very conservative; let's say he lived two lifetimes a century, and half a hundred for each lifetime is a hundred, and that's one per year. And that's for a calm, ordinary existence, you see.

And now we go back two hundred trillion years, and we'd have two hundred trillion valences. Of course, that's a crude way of arriving at it, but that gives you some idea of the magnitude. I'm just trying to tell you it's big magnitude. You ever run into anybody that just after they talked to you they had your mannerisms? Well, they've just accumulated another valence.

Now, it isn't every time they have talked to somebody. . . because they talk to you once, from there on out they don't just have your valence. They get a new valence from you every-time they talk to you.

Now, have you sneaked up on what the order of magnitude is, see? Well, it's big.

All right. Now, what we're doing is absolutely magical. It's fantastic, and your appreciation of its fantasticity will rise when you realize that we are removing whole onions. Whole onions. It's what's holding the onion together. That's what we're after. We're not interested in peeling this thing endlessly, crying over the dishpan, see?

As a tip to housewives, you peel onions underwater, you cry less. You fill a bowl full of water and peel them underwater. But your hands don't smell any better. Anyhow. . .

But I know of no such ready solution. If it was just a forever situation, forever valences, what would you finally wind up with, you see? You'd wind up with a forever auditing So lighter techniques tend to do a forever job.

Now, we were accidentally taking this thing apart when we get the engram necessary to resolve the case . . we would probably pluck one of these valences when we were being successful. The engram ran easily, and we didn't go back earlier than it or anything, and we didn't have to do anything funny about it. We've accidentally arrived in it.

It's quite interesting that a lot of people who have been running Dianetics go down the track on these new routines and they find the holes in the track that they've already erased by Dianetic procedures. They've contacted that old engram before, or they hardly even noticed that it's been contacted. It makes their ca8e much easier to run because they've already had it desensitized.

You get out here . . some member of the public . . and you'll get back to the age of fifteen, see? Well, a person who's had a lot of auditing of course goes back earlier much faster. You'd be surprised how explosive this can be.

Now, Routine 3D isn't designed for your case. It is not designed for your case. Your case does not require this much. You could undoubtedly, with me running the tiller on the thing, one way or- the other go Clear on Routine 3. With this modifier gimmick, we would have gotten the modifier out. You did it. Most of you are after modifiers. In that one week, you got the modifiers. And you got those things brought out. Well, that was just speeding it up a little bit. But you could have gone Clear eventually on earlier routines.

But this isn't true of the general public. The reason why you're having difficulty auditing the general public is this is so beefed up, it's so highly charged. This is a case that has never had any charge taken off of any kind whatsoever. They don't even know that they remember and have an engram connected with their puppy's death at the age of five, see? They don't realize that's got a big secondary, you see? These cases are highly charged up cases.

Well, now, let's get back to what we were talking about, about these modifiers. Without relieving any more than just the casual, run-of-the-mill problems of his life that you would run into and relieve with a Problems Intensive . . that's quite vital . . that will keep the fellow in-session. Without doing any more than that, you're actually going to launch this fellow onto the whole track. And now you're going to pick up a modifier. And you're going to pick up the various parts you need, you see, just like the modifier, out of thin air. And you're going to have a hell of a time, that's all. You're going to hold him in-session by strapping him down in the chair. And you can't do that to the general public. And we had to have another method.

So, I could see that it wouldn't be too difficult for us to go ahead and teach this method and find it on Scientologists, but I could foresee that there was great . . would be great difficulty in your trying to find this thing on casual public . . ,people who hadn't been audited very much. Why? The modifier will be in there with sledgehammers. You're not going to get near it. The more charged up the case is, the less secondaries they've had off, the less this and the less that, well, the harder such a thing is to reach.

Now, I anticipated as far as I could into the difficult case. All right. But at the same time I did say that you were having difficulty and there was no particular reason for you to master a relatively difficult, sporadic, artistic technique like blowing phrases out of a bank. That is quite a technique, you know? And trying to hold somebody still while you do it is quite arduous and too arduous for it to be used much on the public.

I saw from time to time one of these things being blown in old Dianetic processing. I remember this airline pilot who came in, sent by American Airlines, I think it was, to the 42 Aberdeen Road, Elizabeth, New Jersey. And the airline company wanted to know what was this Dianetics, sent this guy over and we tried to find out something about him. And actually one of the students at that time, with the idea of phrases and the key phrase on which the fellow's life was pinned . . we already had that idea, you see . . blowing it just like that with repeater technique and without a meter. Pretty good, huh?

Student took him upstairs and he found the guy's line, phrase, everything else. What was the trouble with the guy . . he had failed every time he had had a job out in civil life, you know. Soon as he got in aviation, why, he was more or less all right. And that's because of a continuous phrase his mother used to feed him all the time. And it could only have been effective if it had been the modifier. He had a part of a

modifier, and that's what we took off the case. "He was no earthly good." So he could be an airline pilot but he couldn't run a garage.

And this absolutely made the fellow feel marvelous. They just repeater-techniqued the thing into view and out of existence, and that was it. That was it. That changed his whole life.

Another one, a child dying of leukemia, and we shot a phrase out of the bank, "make your blood turn to water." What's leukemia? The blood turns to water.

Shooting phrases out of a case can produce a considerable change in the case, but it's not uniform. It is not something that you sit down with any confidence and do. Because you may do it today, and you may do it in two weeks, and in two weeks, why, you may have the case so steamed up that you can get nowhere near anything. You know, you get the idea. I mean, it's a rough go. You pays your money, and you takes your chance. It's that kind of a thing

Well, we don't want anything to do with that type of technique if we can possibly manage it. Let's get something which is ascertainable and which runs smoothly. So the answer to getting the modifier was to take the pressure off the other side of the problem. Now, some of you right this minute have been sitting there, while assessing as a pc, and have all of a sudden felt sort of weight lift off of you, particularly on an opposition terminal or an opposition goal. And suddenly the auditor reads two, three, four in a row or something like this, and you . . all of a sudden you feel light. You feel strangely different somehow. Something odd has happened to you. And actually they haven't even found anything, you know. They're just assessing the list. And all of a sudden, why, you feel something passing off somewhere or another. Have any of you felt that?

All right. As an auditor in auditing somebody, you don't pay too much attention to a tone arm during an assessment. But you might have noticed a sudden craboom! of a tone arm on a pc during a reading. Well now, that is simply the person is losing some weight. What you watch there is a few billion valences going. They're just piling right on off the top of the modifier, you know? They go pfffft.

You're actually not really running anything out on the reverse side. What you're doing is just taking tension off the pc's side. You see, the opposition goal, the opposition terminal . . the opposition terminal comes first, of course. And this opposition terminal . . "Oh, is that what I've been fighting," see?

And this recognition, "Oh, yes, is that what he's been fighting," you see? This recognition of this, and its ideas is... and he doesn't even have to come close to that one. Just that he's in the vicinity of it starts doing things, see? Similarly with the terminal. I mean, just that he's in the vicinity of what he's been opposing He feels like somebody's been playing at swords blindfolded in a dark cellar with an Ethiopian for an opponent, you know.

Then here he is; all of a sudden some of this stuff starts coming to view. And it lightens up. The reverse side over here lightens up. You see, his idea therefore doesn't have to be so tightly fixed in because it's not opposed by so much charge. You got the idea?

Now, let's get back to this stick. There's five foot-pounds of energy pushing from right to left and five foot-pounds of energy pushing . . foot-pounds pushing from left to right. At the impact point you get a continuous balance because it's five foot-pounds and five foot-pounds. See? There it hangs.

Now, you've got to have at least five foot-pounds, or something like that, of energy to disturb this thing You could probably disturb it with some other foot-poundage from some other quarter, but it'll be some order of magnitude of five foot-pounds. In other words, you've got to come over here and you've got to push with an additional poundage, or over here and push with an additional poundage. Well, that's all right because you're still . . it's not going to unbalance. It's just going to kind of wobble as you put it in on both sides, if you can get the idea. Got it?

And if you push it down this way, well, it might take just a fraction of an ounce to deflect it down slightly. That's why, you see, perhaps that compares to your prior confusion. You find a prior confusion

to a problem and nothing much came off, but the problem disappears. It's quite mysterious. Maybe it even follows the laws of mechanics. Who knows?

But anyhow, here are these two five foot-pound forces. Now, your auditing would have to be five foot-pounds . . something in the order of five foot-pounds, in other words, to move this thing to left or right or do something about it. You got the order of magnitude here? It's very hard to put this into mechanical terms. I'm just trying to give you some kind of an idea.

All right. Supposing we had some method, you see, not of increasing the force from the left to the right or the force from the right to the left, see? Not of increasing this. Supposing we had the idea of simply, out of thin air, deleting some of the five foot-pounds. And let's have five foot-pounds pushing in from left to right. And let's reduce this right to left force to three foot-pounds.

Well, something's going to start going, see? Now we've got an unbalanced situation. Do you see how you could do that? Now, you can unbalance this hung in time rather easily by the deletion of force. All other systems, even though they were a millionth of an ounce, would be the addition of force. You would add force.

Well, if you're auditing added force-or had to add force . . let's look at this order of magnitude. The balance in this fellow's mind might measure well on an E-Meter, but its original force might have been a space ship colliding with a planet. I mean of that magnitude, which is eight billion foot-pounds versus eight billion foot-pounds at the point of impact.

Now, that means your auditing would have to be of the order of magnitude of eight billion foot-pounds. And do you feel that energetic?

Now, if you can take the impact apart, it will simply be on the basis of reducing it down to five billion foot-pounds on one side of it, see? Now, oh, well, let's reduce it down now to three billion foot-pounds on one side only. Oh, well, now let's reduce it down to a hundred foot-pounds on one side only. Something is going to blow up someplace, isn't it? You still couldn't possibly have trapped eight billion foot-pounds versus one hundred foot-pounds. See what would happen? Everything would just go boom, boom, zoom. A lot of energy would be released in various directions. But you have not, then, had to get in there and push harder against this thing, one way or the other, to unsettle it. I can give you a mechanical, as I just have, understanding of the thing It comes close to that type of thing. It's a study in forces. It's really a study in forces because a thetan's ideas add up to energy which adds up to force.

You ever been in a glare fight? And did you ever have the idea that you might possibly push over that wall if you looked at it too hard. Have you ever had this idea? Or that you might pull it in on you or something like this? Have you ever had the idea that you might move something with an idea? Well, you're pretty careful not to because it can lead to a lot of difficulty, you think.

But in the mind the idea consists of the force. See, you don't have eight billion foot-pounds still residual in the mind. It isn't actually that much force. But it's an idea equivalent to eight billion foot-pounds. It's the idea of eight billion foot-pounds. And there still is some energy, and there still is some force. And there still is some thrust in the mind. And the pc feels this shift, he knows what's going to happen. He knows what's going to happen. Everything is going to blow up. Huh. Did you ever suddenly, accidentally move a mass on a pc? Pc almost goes that way. Did you ever do it? Did you ever have a pc feel he was suddenly splitting in half and part of him flying off into space?

One of these goofball things . . it doesn't happen very often . . but an auditor gives an auditing command, particularly with a pc who is not prepared for it, the pc's taken unawares. He's a little bit surprised. It's bad auditing If you've done it, recognize it for what it was. There was no smooth approach to it. It's just after you've had an ARC break. It was just after you changed the process too rapidly. It was just after something. And you got this pc suddenly felt something go, and boy, did he object to it. And after that, he's just holding on, just like this, you know, ahaa-ahaa-ahaa. You know, just scared stiff something was going to slip now, you know? And sometimes they feel the bank go a billionth of an inch, you know? And they say, "Uh-uh. That's it. I've had it."

You know these guys that only one tech . . one technique will work on them, but next time you audit them you have to have another technique? Did you run into that case? It's quite ordinary. The Black Five case is very often this way. Boy, if you were auditing him well on Tuesday and you were just getting along fine on this "get the idea of" sort of process, or whatever it was, and you just didn't have enough hours in Tuesday to make the session totally consecutive to it being flattened . . on Wednesday he comes into session and he is not about to get any results from that process. And no further results are going to come from that process.

Every process works once. This is not an unusual case. It's usually the Black Five. You don't notice it because the processes you're running are repetitive in spite of what he's trying to do. He can't stop them. But if he had his way he would, because he gets a little change and the change itself makes him nervous. So he's got the brakes on that process.

Now, you've got to run another process, and you've got to run that. And that will only run as long as he doesn't put the brakes on. So very light processes run on cases of that type give you this aspect if you have to have a process a session. Next session you've got to have a new process. Next session you've got to have a new process. Next session you've got to. . . You've run into them. I see people from Central Orgs nodding. Yes, they've seen a lot of these guys. It drives a D of P crazy. They're just running wonderfully on Tuesday. We were getting the idea of winning, you know. "Get the idea of winning. Fine. Get the idea of losing. Fine." Those were wonderful. There's nothing wrong with this. It was just gorgeous. But Wednesday he comes back in. Absolutely nothing happens on the same exact process. And on Tuesday it wasn't flat.

Well, this case is so much in balance . . it's the high tone arm case . . the case is so much in balance that if he feels anything start to shift his idea of the amount of mass that is going to shift and the things that are going to happen are so catastrophic, you see, that he just goes oo,oo,oo,no,no,ho-hoho. Oh! Now what makes him do that? That's because it's his ideas versus the other determined ideas of his life. Ah, well, the idea he's directly opposing is the first idea that you will find. And you find that idea with his goal.

You'll find that idea, and you'll find the first idea he's opposing. You find the goal, and then you can find the goal opposition terminal . . the opposition terminal to his goal. And then you can find the opposition idea to his goal. And all of a sudden that stands there all revealed. You got what this is. You know who or what it was and what its ideas were. You know that now.

All right. You had just gotten rid of all but the last hundred pounds of force on the opposition side. And it can't stay stable anymore. Actually, it'll never be stable again . . that particular problem. It can't be hung up in time that way ever again because you've taken the thing out on the thing he would pay the least attention to going away.

He doesn't care what you do to the other side. He's agin them. He'd kill them, man. Most of these opposition terminals you run into, the pc sits there and he isn't saying very much about it. But if you got him to chattering about what should really happen or what he might possibly have done at one time or another to such people, he's liable to demonstrate a slight amount of misemotion. Have you noticed that, you know?

In other words, he doesn't like that terminal over there. So what you do to the terminal is all right with him. Now, what you do to him isn't all right with him. If he's in a terrific games condition, as your people off the street . . your raw meat cases . . would be, in terrific games conditions, you know. They're splintered down to about one-sixteenth of an inverted dynamic, see? And the rest of it is totally them and me, somewhere down the line, you know?

Give a panhandler a sixpence sometime, and if you had him on the meter at that moment of what he thought of you, the amount of gratitude which he actually displayed and so forth, you'd be quite shocked. He's down to a "me" that is against all of "them," ha-ha, uhhh. So if you want to put him in jail, he's going to object. Or if you're going to take anything away from him, he's going to object. Or if you're actually going to do anything with him, he's going to object. If you just asked him to move over to the side of the sidewalk for a moment, he's going to object. That's all there is to it.

Ahhhhh, but wouldn't he take a great deal of joy as just as he is standing there arguing with the cop, why, you came along and distracted the attention of the cop and gave the cop a bad time. You can just see that panhandler, you know, sort of dust himself off, and, "Haaaa. Haaaa. Serves him right," you know. In fact, you could do almost anything to the cop, and the panhandler would applaud you. Now, the police might not. But the panhandler will. Do you see?

So a pc will sit there and let you gun down his worst enemy with the greatest of pleasure and be very pleased with you as an auditor. And I don't know if you've noticed how pleased the pc is when you're finding opposition goals and terminals. They're sometimes very sour but it's at the terminal, not at the auditor so much.

They feel upset, but that's their areas of least blame of the auditor. You start finding opposition terminals, you won't get many ARC breaks from a pc. You can do anything you want to, to that goal and terminal over there . . ha-ha-ha-hahhh. Of course, to this panhandler, the total goal . . the total goal for every terminal would be "to do me in," see? It'd be some version of that, see . . "to do me in." You know, here's people painting buildings, and they don't even look at him, you know. They'd never even seen him. He could stand in front of them, and they hardly notice him. And they're busy slopping paint on the building, and so forth. But he knows what their goal is . . "to do him in," you see?

The pc is backed up against the wall, he's not a panhandler, but he's backed up against the wall as far as the rest of this particular area or session is concerned. You could go over a list here. And you could go over an opposition goal or an opposition terminal list.

Now, here's an opposition list: "A policeman, a father, a meter, a teacher, a tutor, a governess." Got the idea? You could go over this opposition list and you could say to this pc, "Now, would it make any difference to you if I shot a policeman?"

"That'd be pretty good, you know."

And you go down the rest of the way and this is what you would get, you see? They'd applaud on this. It's perfectly fine with them. And of course their ideas are braced into this structure of hostility. Now, you actually aren't tricking the pc. The pc actually can recognize exactly what you're doing. And it's perfectly all right. Because what you're doing is unbalancing the resistance toward his own goal and survival line as he sees them. And you're unbalancing the resistance. So he's winning, see? What is a battle but the person who is winning is winning, you see? And the object of the battle is to win.

Of course, you get a pc "and not to win" as part of his goal, he might be a little bit upset with you if you set him in the direction of winning. But the odd part of it is the technology even overcomes that. That's just another piece of the parts.

All right. So as the individual goes along . . as the individual goes along through Routine 3D, you have your best opportunity of finding what the pc has by finding out the things about the opposition.

Now, you can always lighten up the opposition without any resistance from the pc. That's dead easy. And also you can always find the pc thinks the opposition pressure is taken off. You get the rationale? And you'll find out it'll work just exactly on that one, two, three, four from now on, providing you don't go squareheaded on me and start doing your assessments upside down by turning the pages randomly at the last Book of Job or something.

You see, it'll go on just . . just . . just happening easily because what you do is take the weight off the pc at the point where he couldn't care less what you do. to that particular zone.

All right. Now I'll show you a reverse way to do this. This is not the way to do this. This is exactly reverse wrong way to do this. We assess a person very carefully to find out exactly what they're fondest of in life. And we make a list of "Of whom was you fond, Mack . . ." Because we couldn't call it auditing, so we wouldn't follow Model Session to do this sort of thing

All right. And he says, “My grandmother, my youngest daughter, my old dog, and my car.” You assess this very, very carefully and we find out that “youngest daughter” wins on the assessment.

Now, you say, “Now we’re going to erase all the memories connected with your youngest daughter.”

Well, do you think you’d stick to this pc in the session very long if you did this?

All right. The pc sees his goal is a good thing, and he sees his game as a good thing This is what’s idiotic about it all, that it’s been getting him into trouble now for the last hundred trillennia is totally overlooked by him. So this would be the wrong way to clear somebody on a Routine 3 type process. Let’s get the goal. Let’s get the goal. All right, now let’s erase it.

Look, isn’t that what he’s objecting to? Isn’t that what he sits there in an assessment and objects to? That you’re invalidating him, you’re invalidating his goals. That you’re doing this. That you’re doing that. Well, the rudiments wouldn’t go out if you weren’t. So when I say faster clearing. . . There are many other reasons here, but this one should not be overlooked. Ha-ha. You get this goal, and then you get his terminal, and then you run it on the Prehav Scale to erase it. Oh, yeah? Don’t you think you’re going to have a little trouble in a session? And you do. You do. You get so many hours deep into clearing and all of a sudden the pc kind of decides he doesn’t want to be Clear and he doesn’t want to do this and he doesn’t want to do that.

And of course the enemy is still on his front doorstep and he knows he’s feeling better, but he just doesn’t want to go on with this. Well, now, what was this brake? Why did he put on the brakes? That’s because you were attacking an ally to the exclusion of the enemy. Now, he wouldn’t mind you getting rid of the ally providing the enemy was cared for. You see the rationale?

A bunch of farmers are standing out there with pitchforks and scythes and blunderbusses and they’re stretched across the road. And a bunch of regular cavalry come up and say, “What’s the matter boys?” And these fellows say, “Well, it’s the skirmish line on that other army. And it’s been getting real close to our homes, and there have been a bunch of looters and things around here and we just mean to shoot every one of those characters that we can.”

And the troopers always make this mistake. They say, “Well, disperse and lay down your arms and go home.”

This is how you get revolutions started. A bunch of guys are protecting their homes in some fashion. You tell them to lay down their arms and so forth. You say, “Well, we’ll take care of it,” in some indifferent fashion, you know. And, “Well, lay down your arms,” and so forth.

That’s not the way to do it at all. If you want them actually to go home, the best thing to do is go out and find a looter and hang him; and then they lay down their arms and go home. Got the idea?

They do that with the greatest of ease then. There’s nothing to that. You see that as a procedure. They know you’re going to do something active, and they know what’s wrong with them. They know exactly what’s wrong with them. It’s the enemy. Well, isn’t that what they think? It’s the enemy. That’s what’s wrong with them. They know what’s wrong with them. Of course, this isn’t what’s wrong with them at all. It’s their own knuckleheaded insistence on having a goal that they then hang a modifier to, that they then apply in some peculiar and particular direction and find themselves a good enemy and then keep it mocked up. That’s actually what happened, wasn’t it?

But that isn’t the way the pc looks at it. And I think that there isn’t a pc in this room at this moment that can’t look at this analytically, and individually would be resistive toward the whole idea. That couldn’t possibly be it because “look what they’ve done to me.”

Well, of course, you know nobody digs himself out of the hole unless you run off what he’s done to them. But a pc won’t look at this as long as there’s an army standing out there that is going to fill him full of bullet holes the second he takes his finger off his number. So he’s going to stay fully armed with all of

his tricks. He's going to remain a very dangerous person. He's going to remain as fully dangerous as he possibly can because the whole enemy is there in full panoply.

Now, by assessment, you have actually seen a person go a little bit clearer here, some of you on the opposition terminal and opposition goal. You know, they went zzuhuhuh off, you know, a little lighter. Because I see in your reports, report after report . . . I don't know. You're not picking this up from each other because it's just the natural description of the phenomena that report after report I've read . . "the pc felt lighter at the end of session." You've probably written it yourself on an auditing report. "Pc felt lighter at the end of session. Pc felt less heavy. Pc felt as if he was winning." Well, he was. That's the first and foremost reason why he felt that way.

But the mechanical reason he felt that way is in toward him, facing in toward him, were these eight billion foot-pounds of thrust, and you've reduced them down to only a billion, see, and with just the assessment. And he sees then, because you reduced them to a billion, that they might reduce further than that. And he now doesn't have to stand there fully armed, braced and barebreasted against life, you see.

Of course, you take away . . I've said barebreasted, but he's fully armed and shielded against life, and he doesn't really want you to come along and take away his shield, and he doesn't want you to take away the rest of his equipment because he knows what it's facing He knows it's dangerous not to have those things. And of course, that is the only reason he interrupts clearing

The fellow is standing there. He's got a lamppost in his right hand. He's got his pockets filled full of tomato gravy. He has his left ear torn in three pieces and he's got lumbago.

And you say to him, "Well, now, son, let's straighten up here. You don't have to have your ear torn in three pieces and you might at least empty your pockets out. Very messy."

You know, he doesn't pay a bit of attention to you. He knows that's what he needs. He knows that these are the exact items necessary to defend himself in life. He knows those are the items. Those are the only things that make him dangerous.

Why does he want to be dangerous? The enemy, of course. And, you see, you're stupid. You never realized this, but you're stupid. You don't know they're there. He doesn't either, but... Yeah, that is the way the mind hangs together. And that's why you're taking it apart this exact way with Routine 3D.

You say opposition terminal. Well, that's good and solid, and he can put his attention on it in a hurry. And the reason you get the terminal before the goal is of course he can put his attention on something solid and then you can materialize the goal out of that solid. And that's easier to do than put his attention from an idea, his own goal, onto an idea, see? That's a little bit harder to do. So the easy way to do it is to find the opposition terminal. Then he knows who or what he's fighting Oh, that's great.

Now, let's find out what their idea really is from the pc's viewpoint. Of course, it actually isn't that person's idea at all. The person lived with Bessie Bell for eighteen years, man and boy, and you start running him, and you find Bessie Bell is the enemy and wife of the enemy or something like this, or woman is the enemy. And you shake this all down and you'd be amazed, but so would Bessie Bell, to find out that her total goal in life . . this would not agree if you were processing Bessie Bell, you couldn't use this goal . . but her total goal from this fellow's viewpoint and so forth, her total goal, actually, is to make a great deal of noise while setting the table and doing dishes. And that's her total goal in life. You don't realize that. She doesn't realize that. Nobody knows that but the pc.

Now, you just try and run Bessie Bell, if you had her as a pc, on "to make noise with dishes." You know it won't assess.

Now, from her viewpoint . . your pc's goal which is "to be a great building builder," or something like that . . well, from her viewpoint, why, his is "to track mud all over the floors and to eat biscuits in bed." And that's his total goal. Well, don't try to run it on him because it won't assess.

Well, these are just the offbeats of existence. There's a lecture about this already. It is the first congress I ever gave personally in London. The first lecture. It's "Your Ideas of the Other Fellow." That's the basis of aberration, is the aberrated idea of what the other fellow is up to. And it's as simple as that. But this Routine 3D plucks off the foot-poundage of the opposition, and therefore the pc can reach a little further. The pc is a little freer to look. So then the pc is willing to look up and find out what he might do if he failed. Oh, he's gotten a unfixation now to do this.

So you've unfixed him to a point where you can find his modifier which is perhaps "to run away and commit suicide in case I ever run into a Scientologist." You know, he's had it on the whole track for a hundred thousand years. But anyway, he's got a modifier, and he'll give up his modifier, and then you can find it. And now, only now, can you find the pc's goal and terminal and be absolutely certain that you get it right on the bat. Because it's got to be the terminal for the goal plus modifier.

And the reasons you used to get such tremendous terminals lists . . you know those things, I've seen them run to a thousand and more terminals and so on . . it's just because you go on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on, because, of course, you weren't asking for terminal plus modifier. And you were finding, by accident, the terminal plus modifier. That is, it would finally fall out, but Lord, at the end of how much processing, how much assessment? It was very difficult.

Now, we go on to the other thing . . pc's goal terminal . . and we get the Prehav level for this particular thing. And now we actually, in 3D . . and to be very honest with you at this stage of its development . . we are in the zone at this point of test. This other up to step 5 is solid as the Rock of Gibraltar.

But I'm still, as I told you before, experimenting with the commands on this sort of thing. I want to see exactly where this thing whizzes in beings. And you're not up to running any commands yet, and you won't be for another couple of days, so I've got a little chance there to do the side research to make it faster when you get to it.

We could run just what we have been running and win on it. I've already had that checked. And it'll be perfectly all right. I just want to see if we can't really get a whizzer, really get a whizzer going on this one.

Now, I already have found out that this process alone, running the ordinary terminal and so forth, will run levels out so fast that you can no longer run the twenty minute rule. That's quite interesting Your twenty minute rule of running is still under inspection by me. It is apparently out. And we'll go back to the Joburg rules of running which were the original rules. And we actually are looking them up. I will issue a bulletin on them, but they were running to a stuck. You run it to a stick. You actually let the thing stick. There it is. It's stuck.

And then assess again because you're not going to run it for days. I can trust you not to do that. And the reason we left it still wobbling was so as not to make an error. But you'll find that in running this, even on the old way we used to run Routine 3 terminals, that it sticks quite promptly, and goes downscale quite promptly. And you might even find yourself doing two levels a session. That's right. And you run it to stuck. And when you're absolutely sure that it is stuck and it's not going to move . . . I don't know what the time limit was. That's the only thing that is out. And we have to look it up. But it's . . I'd say it offhand, it'd probably be about . . oh, if it's stuck for about five, six, ten minutes or something of that sort, I think I'd come off of it.

But I'd stick it. I'd stick the tone arm. Not the needle. I'd stick the tone arm. And let it go into there chunk. And I'd make sure it was sticking there because the routine behavior on this sort of thing is kind of a pattern for the pc, and you can tell when it's going to stick, and you can tell when it's stuck. And it's a skill which you'll pick up rather rapidly. And after you've seen it two or three times, you'll say well, that's that. There's nothing much to it.

All right. Well, I'm trying to speed up even that. But the data I can give you on that right now is that you run it to stuck. You'll still be all right, because you can still reassess.

In the first place, you've taken enormous weight off the case. Well, how have you taken the weight off the case? Well, you've paid some attention to the opposition, haven't you? And you paid some opposition

ideas some attention. And we got a lot of things as-ised here that were still tough on the case before. All of a sudden as we run these, these get easier and easier and vanish and get all floppy, and they're out.

The bulk of time of 3D is probably devoted to assessment, not to running. That's probably the less time . . on running on it. I don't know. We can't say that broadly yet, but that's just my preinformation on the thing as I look at it. Yea, I see it certainly does evaporate in a hurry. I've already seen two levels flattened in one and one-half hours of auditing. That's fairly fast, isn't it? And you run them to stuck and they all seem to run on the same old Joburg pattern that they were running on originally, which is the tone arm goes up and sticks. Runs all right for a moment, a little while, and then it goes up and sticks and then it sticks. And then you've got to reassess.

Anyway, looking at this a little bit further, there are ways, of course, to use these other parts, and that's all I'm working with on the commands right here at this moment having a little spare time. I'm just looking to see if there isn't some way we can weave these parts in, in a perfectly optimum pattern that will get a faster run on them, see? I've already got them woven in, but let's get it faster than that.

And that ought to be a whizzer. So we're in the throes of running one which we have solved and improving it before you get to the running of it. Pretty good.

Now, when we have this being run on half discharged and dismissed goals, my pity, my sympathy is with you. You've already run these goals halfway down. They are not reacting right. Nothing is reacting right. This is all being fairly rapid at this time. You're going to save time in the long run. But nothing is reacting exactly right. Goals are going in, and goals are going out, and sporadically this way and over the tin cup that way, and so forth. And you'll get to the end of your assessment on many cases, and you won't have any goal, and you won't have any modifier, and you won't have any opposition terminal. You won't have nothing. You'll just have a handful of air.

Well, the only thing that makes it random is you're assessing against half-run goals. Now, there's not enough time for you to have flattened that and then run them. So I'm just throwing that problem into your lap. And you might as well get used to having trouble with assessment. You just might as well get used to living with it. Because what is the trouble? The main trouble with assessment is the rudiments go out and the rudiments go in, and so forth. But about halfway through clearing, which is not too many hours deep in a case now, you're going to run into this trouble anyhow.

You'll think that after you get the person's terminal and goal all patched up and they're squared away and so forth, and you finally got it all discharged and all, you get onto the second one. Now you're on solid ground. Well, you're on uniform ground, quicksand. And that is just simply on this basis: That you find the person's goal, and the goal goes crash, and goes half a dial, rock slam, and oh, marvelous. And you'll find the opposition terminal and half a dial, rock slam, oh, marvelous. And you'll find the opposition goal, and it's a quarter dial rock slam, and you go back and check the goal, and that's a half a dial. And then you go back and check this, and you say, "Well, I'll go on and finish this anyway," and an eighth of a dial rock slam is the opposition goal.

Well, you go back and find the modifier now, and you'll find a half a dial rock slam. Marvelous. Half a dial rock slam. And oh, that's good. Well, we thought the whole thing was disappearing, you know, and it's easy, now that we've got the half a dial rock slam, and so forth. All right. Now let's get the goal plus modifier, and let's find the pc's terminal. And we've put the goal plus the modifier together, and we've got an eighth of a dial rock slam. Well, this is not so good.

Well, let's go back and check it against the goal and the other parts. And we find out they're all eighth of a dial. Oh, well, let's go on and do the goals terminal assessment anyway. And we go ahead and we do a goals terminal assessment, and we're just about halfway through the list, and everything is going fine, and things are nulling, and things are nulling, and things are nulling, and we jus . . looks . . looks marvelous. And we go on down to the bottom of the list, and go back through the list again. We go back through the list again, and then we just go . . no list.

And you say well, the rudiments are out. So you go back and put the rudiments in, but they're in. And you go back and look at the list, and then you go back and check the goal, and then you check the

modifier. And it's gone. There's nothing There's nothing no place, nowhere. You've lost it all. It's evaporated.

You get your rudiments in. You check everything. You check everything across the boards. And you make all possible cross-checks across the board. But that goals terminal . . you never even got to the Prehav Scale. So you say, well, better luck next time. We go back and we find one, and by George, we find a nice beefy goal there. It's a quarter of a dial rock slam, and everything is going along fine, and we assess it right on down. Everything is working out perfectly, right up to the moment we find the opposition terminal. That whole list goes null. The whole list.

We go back and we say, "We've got to check the goal. It's not there. But it is there. But no, it's not, it isn't there. No, it is. No. I . . the . . huh . . hmm."

Now, the reason I am telling you this is because you could make the most serious mistake of your career to drop it at that point. Because the opposition goal is in, the modifier is in, the goal plus terminal is in, and they will all do a quarter of a dial rock slam the instant you find them. And no longer.

So, we get something you will have to learn how to do in 3D. You'll have to assess on everything going out. And this is a marvelous time for you to learn how right now, because these things that you're running are practically run out or half run out, and they're washing.

So right at the beginning we get the opportunity of learning the hard way because the hard . . the end of this thing can get very rough on you.

Now, you only want an equal needle reaction to each part of 3D, see, to the goal, the opposition terminal, the opposition goal and the modifier goals plus terminal and the goal-plus-modifier terminal. You only want equal actions across those and the Prehav Scale at any given moment.

And if while you were assessing the action is getting less, you'll find it's also getting less on the other parts.

Now, for instance, you'll find that if the goal . . if you . . we can find the modifier, but it keeps going in and out. I'm talking about an advanced run now. This is all data on advance runs. This person has already been entered into clearing, and so on. And the thing's going in and out. It reads every third time you say it. Do you know the goal will now read every third time you say it? See, the goal was checked out perfectly at first. Now it reads every third time you say it. Every part you have will read every third time you say it. You get the idea?

See, that's how faintly this can be read. They're all going to act the same, and you're going to get fooled on that because you're going to get so doggone nailed down to the opposition goal, for instance, and you finally going to find one. You've got the whole list run down, and there's only one, and it's acting and it's reacting, and it's acting and it's reacting, and it's acting and it's reacting

You say, "Well, we've got to do something else. It's acting and it's react . . ." Now check that goal, man. Let's go back and check the goal.

Is it acting and reacting and not acting and acting and not acting and acting and not acting, too? Like that other one is? Because that would tend to prove it out. There's another cross-check, you see? Is what you found now acting like the goal acts? Because the goal action can change every time you find one of these parts, the goal can act a little bit less.

The point of reference . . let me put it this way . . against which you're verifying is itself deintensifying. So of course, that goal is the point of reference, and as it deintensifies, so do all other reactions tend to deintensify.

But where the goal is in strong, and the thing you have just got down to and selected as the final part of your list is going in and going out and going in and going out, and you test the goal. You say, "To build great buildings" and it goes pow! And you say, "To build great buildings." Pow! "To build great

buildings." Pow! And you say this opposition goal, see, "To eat up timbers," see. You say, "To eat up timbers." It goes wiggle. "To eat up timbers." None. "To eat up timbers." Half a dial drop. "To eat up timbers." None.

And you say, "To build great buildings." Pow! "To build great buildings." Pow!

You got the idea? Huh? "Build great buildings" is still in and still constant and still of the same magnitude. Well, you've just got the wrong item, that's all. Simple as that. You've just got the wrong item. Or the rudiments are completely crazy on the subject of this particular item where there's been an invalidation of this item, or there's something wrong with this item and this list that you are doing. Not with anything else.

You haven't bled it down to the point where you've got every single possible goal that the pc would have for that. You just haven't got a complete list. You've done a poor job technically. That's all.

See, now differentiate between doing a poor job technically . . in other words, not doing this one, two, three of get the rudiments in, bleed the meter down, sensitivity 16, set your meter back to a dial drop and then assess, you see. Get your rudiments in check, you know, that kind of thing That will hold, and it will hold straight through. Well, you've done something there wrong. The rudiments aren't in or you haven't gotten the whole list or something's off.

See, if the person didn't invalidate on the list, the rudiments would be out, and so forth. And there's something technically wrong.

Now, you've got to differentiate between a technical error and a fading goal. And don't you ever dare cross the two because, you see, it'd be very pleasant to be able to say, every time you made a technical error, that there was now something wrong with the assessment. See, that'd let everybody out from under except the pc. I don't say any of you'll do this, but I do point it out. I do point it out quite strongly that that is the way it is.

You're assessing against a vanishing standard. The standard is vanishing, in other words, this pinpoint on which you're referring everything. You're measuring a room, and you've driven a nail in the middle of the room, and you've got a tape. And you take this tape and you measure the distance to every corner of the room and to the ceiling and the floor and the lightbulbs and the fireplace, and so forth. And you've got all these distances, and they're all relative to that pin in the middle of the room. And being relative to that pin, everything is fine as long as nobody moves the pin. Yeah, it's okay. I mean you can always know where to put this room back together again as long as you've got that pin.

All right. And you come back and you look at it. Now, a whole room depends on this pin, see, all your measurements. And you come back and you look at it and you find out it's half its size. Makes you a little bit nervous, doesn't it. Well, actually, it's fine. The case is going Clear, but you come back again, you take a look at this pin; it's a quarter of the size. And you come back and take a look at it again, and it's appearing and then disappearing, and appearing and then disappearing. Rrrrrrr. And then you come back and take a look at it and it's just a kind of a little mark that occasionally is there, but usually isn't. And that's what you've got as a reference point to measure the rest of the room by.

All right. Now, this would be very difficult if only the pin moved. Actually, because the pin is a standard, everything moves with the pin. The distances go in and out just as the pin goes in and out, you see?

So if that nail gets half the size then, for instance, your goal modifier, when it's finally checked (although the first time you hit it you get a bang out of it) . . it'll settle down suddenly and the pin's gone half its size, the goal modifier is now half the size that it would have been. Got the idea? Everything goes down in exact proportions, which is lucky for you. It's just lucky that it does that.

See, it's all part of the same charge, and as it discharges, the whole charge reads the same. And these are all parts of the same charge. So of course, as the pin goes down, all the other things go down too.

And when it finally blows up, it only blows up if you've got all parts of it.

Now, this sets up a considerable technical problem for you. And you think I may be stressing this a little bit hard, but you'll encounter this problem often enough.

The problem on assessment is how do you continue the list? It's this idiotic problem. You've got a Goals Assessment, see? Now, that's fine. You can make a Goals Assessment entirely independent of everything else and wind up with a goal, see, because that's the center pin from which you're measuring everything by. Why, that Goals Assessment, that's just dandy. You can get a goal, and there it is. And everybody's happy with this as a goal.

All right. Fine. Now we do an opposition assessment. Ha-ha. That's fine. Good. We can do an opposition assessment, and it's all right. And we finally get there. And we get the opposition terminal, and that's fine. And we put the opposition terminal down.

All right. But notice something here. That in order to get an opposition goal, you must have had the opposition terminal. Oh, you need the part in 2 in order to do 3. Ho-ho. And look, look here. You need the parts in 2 and 3 in order to do 4 and find the modifier. And look, you've got to have the parts of 1 and 4 in order to do number 5. And if you haven't got those parts, you can't do the next step, can you?

Now, listen to me carefully. Wake up and listen to me carefully now, because you never dare leave 3D incomplete on any assessment. Now, remember that. Never leave 3D incomplete from parts 1 to 5. You may never get to 6, and that's all right. But never let it be incomplete from 1 to 5. Never. Always complete that assessment.

Well, how are you going to complete an assessment . . this is your main problem here . . how are you going to complete an assessment that disappears at item 3? Everything folded up at item 3.

You didn't even get the opposition goal. You got close to the opposition goal, and then suddenly . . even the rudiments were in and everything else . . the opposition goals, the opposition assessment, and the goal itself apparently blew. It just went like a chain of firecrackers. Brrrrrp. Bang!

Well now, you say, "Oh, well, that's a good thing. Now we don't have to do 4 and 5."

Well, listen to me carefully. If you don't do 4 and 5, you're going to leave this pc with a hidden aberration that nobody from here on is ever going to suspect. And people will be saying, "You know, Clears act peculiarly." Yeah, well, this one is acting peculiarly. He's still got 4 and 5 stuck and vanished and totally out of sight. And that's because somebody didn't complete the whole 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Now, how can you complete the whole 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, if 3 went? Because you've got to have 3 in order to get 4. You must have had 2 and 3 in order to get 4, right? You've got to have these. They're going to stack up one way or the other. Well, how you gonna get them?

Well, listen to this one carefully. You just take the last item you had active and get the next one. You were doing a Goals Assessment, and you do the last item active or the one on the list you can get to kick now and then, which would of course eventually become the last item that's active because it'd kick now and then before it disappeared, see.

So therefore, every time you read one of these things . . . Reading them three at a time uniformly is now a good weapon in your hands because if it wasn't null, you're going to make a mark, you see. And you're going down the line, you see. Then you can tell how many times you've been over the list and therefore how many times that thing reacted.

Even though the whole list suddenly blew up on you and wasn't there anymore and you couldn't find anything else on the list, and you just find your hand full of air, well, you do have, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, you do have one item which reacted five times. Oh, well, that's very nice. That's very fine. We have an item that reacted five times.

Now, the only time when you ever turn an E-Meter up to sensitivity 16 to do an assessment, you rapidly read them one time each. This time carefully preserving them to keep them from going out. Read them in a soft tone of voice. Go down the list one time each and note the greatest reaction, and do your assessment at sensitivity 16 as long as you can. And then if it all blows up and goes out the window, you still have got an awfully good idea exactly what the item was. Well, that was it. It was firing there for a moment. Now, it's gone.

Use that and go to the next item. And do you know that you can get a whole assessment done on the next item even though the former item is gone? Because the next item will stay in long enough to do an assessment. And now you'll have to catch the next point on the fly, you know, as it goes overhead, in order to get the next item up the line. Got the idea?

That's the only real cleverness that Routine 3D takes. Of course, it takes a clever auditor to audit anyhow, but this is tricky. This is tricky. It's sort of catching the brass ring on the merry-go-round. You'll find that that list, however, will stay alive until you get close to the actual one, before it blows and things blow before it.

Now, the beauty of it is this: as you get down toward the end, anything nearly approaching accuracy will probably blow it anyway. So as a person goes toward Clear, the death is our penalty accuracy, if we don't hit it right on the head, it's much less. It's much less liability. Try to get it. Try to get it accurately toward the end of an assessment. And you get something . . now listen to me . . get something to carry on to the next section, heh-heh, please. And roll it on down.

You know, it's this: "Well, now look, I've said something and then you had a cognition. What was it you had a cognition on? I mean, what did I say that you had a cognition on?"

And the pc thinks it over. "Well, it's so-and-so and so-and-so."

Ha-ha, good. Write that item down and carry it on to the next list. Got the idea? I mean you could catch these things no matter how faint they got, but it can require some cleverness on your part.

Now, you could waste an enormous amount of time on a half, threequarters, nine-tenths rubbed out item and list and section and so forth, driving yourself and the pc completely around the bend by just not taking what you do have left. And of course, by driving him around the bend, you'll ARC break it or something of that sort, so that it all does go out of existence, and then it's very difficult to get in. And you've just complicated the whole thing

So, develop this little habit, would you please, in doing Routine 3D: As you pass on from . . down from the goal, make a peculiar mark somewhere on the list as the likely . . you don't tell the pc what it is . . just mark it down as the likely one.

If you get in the habit of doing this . . marking down the likely one before you prove it . . as you go later on the case and the case is clearing more rapidly, you will have something left before it vanishes on you suddenly. And you won't get caught adrift on the open sea on a pocket handkerchief. The likely one. That isn't of course what you're going to force on the pc. And if your assessment continues, and you really do get the one, and you notice how far out you are, you will eventually develop a facility for getting just about what it was, you know, right about there.

And of course, as you go on down the list further, the way it's a likely one is the person is giving you the listing, and that sort of thing. And he's given you the whole listing on down toward the end of the listing And you start to assess the thing, you'll develop some sort of thing as, "Which one of these items sticks in your mind?"

"Oh," he says, "well, to shoot turnips. That's really stuck there. Thought about that for a moment or two. I did, yes. I thought about that for a moment or two." A little tick opposite.

Now go on and assess, see. And we find out that it was probably "shoot turnips."

Now, you will learn to catch these things on the fly before they vanish in front of your face. Otherwise, your main trouble in clearing is not going to be auditing It'll suddenly become a nightmare to you. Cases usually audit much more easily as they become Clear, you see, than they did before. They're usually horrible to audit right at the "opening gun," you see.

And that's not true of Routine 3D. The case gets more and more horrible the further it goes.

You get into guesstimates of the situation. And the accuracy with which you must perform, a guesstimate of the situation will be quite a contest as far as you're concerned. But always do all parts of Routine 3D. Never miss. Always do them all.

Go back over and sort of select it all out. If everything has vanished, your rudiments are in, and there's nothing else you can do about it, go over the last list that you did have, somehow or another reconstruct the picture. Somehow or another get what it would have been, and put it down on the next list in order to carry on. Because you'll find that list is still alive.

Now, you can do a complete assessment and be perfectly happy. But remember on that one it's going to happen faster than it happened on the one before. You're going to get a quicker blowout. So on that one, well, it's best idea to get a likely . . the most likely. As you go down the list, which one stuck in your mind . . of all these, which ones do you think would be the most probable of this sort of thing?

And as we're reading it the first time and we suddenly notice as we're reading down the first line, boy, it was an awful jolt there on . . . We noticed that the goal jolt occurred for just an instant on number 16.

Now, we read on down the list. That list is never going to be live again. We go back. There it is. Now we got that one. We carry that over to the next one. Then all of a sudden the whole thing blows like a string of firecrackers.

That's your biggest problem. You see how to do it? Now, of course, you realize that I will scalp you, I will scalp you if I find you suggesting that as the one to the pc. That's just a preventive action.

Now, I'm very glad with the work you are doing on this. I want to compliment you, actually, on the work you are doing on this. It's pretty fine and it gives me great heart in the matter. Your assessment is picking up. It's getting more accurate, and so on. You'll be a perfectly safe auditor on this when your assessments are always 100 percent accurate and you're totally cocky about the whole thing. So that's the frame of mind I want you to assume.

Now, in actuality, your accuracy will increase to the degree that your own case makes progress too, you see? So we've got that one also. So we're working on a very fine front here. There's nothing much wrong with that.

I do feel for you, however, some of you who have had a goal and it flicks, and you have no parts to put down on anything. You're trying desperately to proceed, and so forth. Well, I would frankly much rather have you suffer at Saint Hill than in Bulawayo or Keokuk.

There is no reason to go on and dignify the name of Bulawayo any longer. It means the place where we all got killed. I don't know if any of those from Bulawayo know this, but that's what it means. And it's because there was an old friend of the fellow down there named it.

Anyhow, we don't want everybody being killed down in Bulawayo because somebody can't assess on 3D.

The progress you're making on this . . do you like the progress you're making on this?

Audience: Yes.

Do you see where you're going on this?

Audience: Yes.

Does it look like an easier trail to walk through than the woods you were in before?

Audience: Yes.

All right.

As soon as you get the hang of it, as soon as you see the put together of the thing, and as soon as your own confidence in your ability to assess and keep rudiments in improves, all of a sudden, it'll look just like that. It'll look like nothing to you. And you'll say clearing, smearing . . easy. There's nothing to it. Bang! Bang!

So that's what I want you to work on: positiveness of assessment, speed of assessment, self-confidence in the assessments that you do. and the accuracy of the final result. And then you will find that the whole parts will string together and you'll feel good about it.

In the meantime, I'll get you some hot commands whipped up on this one. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.