RUNNING 3D

A lecture given on
21 November 1961

Thank you.

Okay. Here we are with the 21st of December almost wrapped up. Isn't that right?

You realize you should have been home last week. Oh, no, no. Fortunately, I just remembered. You're saved by the bell here. It's only the 21st of November. Yeah. 21st of November 1961. From the looks of somebody or other around, there's one or two here that look like it . . not you . . that look like they're not going to make it. Well, it's all right. We've been up surveying a burial plot up here on the upper part.

Okay. Now, we're struggling down amongst the modifiers and turning fast corners and curves in the vicinity as oppgoals, oppterminals and this and that and you probably don't know where the hell you're at. Ah, you do. you do. You know where you are. Except you.

Now, there are five things which make man an incomprehensible being. You'd say any one of these things could make the whole man. Any one of these things could make the whole man and because we're so used to things coming in ones in the physical universe, we don't look for a "personality" (quote) (unquote) . . personality, boy, that is the most overused word . . to be composed of five separate things. But because it is composed of five separate things, the person is rather unpredictable and incomprehensible. Maybe not to others, but certainly to himself.

Others may have definite opinions on the individual. People tend to categorize. They say, "Well, that fellow is a swell fellow and that one over there is a skunk and she is a good girl and that one is a tramp," you see? But these facts have been well known for their falsity.

We . . this fellow goes down and robs the bank and then goes home and is very nice to his children, which isn't covered by his being called a bank robber or a thief or something, see. Something.

So man has tended to be very incomprehensible.

Now, I've been on the trail of this for a very long time. What was it that made a man's personality this incomprehensible, this unpredictable? What made human behavior this unpredictable? Was it a survival factor for human behavior to be this unpredictable? A lot of other various things added up along this line, but we finally come to this conclusion: That well, man isn't better off for being a potpourri of five different items. He doesn't lead a better life because of it, and as a matter of fact, the only person he impedes is mostly himself.

These five items are very, very easily listed. You have them on 3D. They are Sections 1 to 5, of 3D and these are the five items which compose a personality:

1. The person's goal.

2. The opposition terminal. What does this person consider an enemy.

Now, well, just to go on and list them:

3. Then there's the opposition goal.

4. And then there is the modifier of the person's own goal.

5. And then there's the person's own terminal.

These are five different items and the combination of these five items do not particularly make a new personality. They make five different facets of aberration to the person.

The person is going to do one or another of these five things . . going to dramatize one or another of these five things in any given situation . . that is not predictable which one he is going to do.

So you don't get one response. Dear old Pavlov, if you were only here now sitting in a back chaiv there as a student. All right, well, I'm sure that one or two of you are Scientologists enough to process him. You'd say, "All right. What is your goal?"

"To mess up dogs," you'd find out.

But poor, old Pavlov, who was really banging his head into this. Stimulus-response, smonse-conce. Who cares! What the devil; what is this stimulus-response mechanism of Pavlov?

Well, you stimulate a dog and the dog woofs. And you stimulate a dog and the dog woofs. Now, that's everything he's . . his thinkingness was based on.

If you do "stimulus A always gets response B, ha-ha-ha. Now, we've got it all made, you know. We're all set. And all we've got to do is apply this to man and when we give stimulus A, we get response B, don't we. Ohhh."

The advertising agencies would love to know this, believe me, because they are very certain that if you show a picture of a beautiful girl on a beer ad, you'll sell beer. Not in some localities. Not in some localities. Hollywood? You'd never sell a glass of beer in Hollywood. That'd have to be a pretty boy.

But, even then, that wouldn't be very predictable either. Stimulus A does not get response B amongst men. Only after you've audited one single person and only after the job is done and the package is all taken apart could you then see which of the five responses might have kicked against stimulus A. But in actuality, even then you don't know. It's just one of the five. One of the five is going to kick against stimulus A.

Now, you could figure out a little narrower than this. You'd say, "Well, on stimulus A, 'a kick in the pants.' " Then this person who had a goal, "to stand still in life," who had an opposition terminal, "an elephant," who had an opposition goal, "move," and who had a modifier, "and never fight," and whose own terminal was "lamppost," all right, what happens if you kick that person in the pants?

Well, does he consider you're an elephant? Or does he become a lamppost because he's standing still? Or are you his enemy or what? What happens? Which one goes in? Which one of the five goes click? Well, you've got a number of them there, any one of which could go click and his response is that unpredictable. It's one of five.

Now, we could give a good guess at it and we'd say, "Well, he'd probably keep on standing there and not know he'd been kicked," because of his goal and so forth, you know. He probably could. He probably could. Or he might turn around and scream to the zoo keepers to come and get this elephant, you know. Who knows exactly what he would do?

There's the unpredictability of the situation. You've got five responses to any given action. Now, did you realize that the person, until you've got it sorted out, with equal facility will dramatize either the oppgoal or his own goal, the oppterminal or his own terminal, the goal or the modifier? You just pays your money, and you takes your chance. You throw a dice out and it's as it comes up.

And in any given situation you might get an interlock of two things which are opposed in his element and you get indecisional action or you get inaction. Because he's got two things that key in simultaneously and he could do either one of these things. And they are opposed as far as this stimulus is concerned and there he is. He just stops, you see, incomprehensibly. There is nothing he could do and yet, obviously, if you look it over on the surface, you'd say, "Well, he could have done . . obeyed any one of five

responses, but two of the responses locked up, so he obeyed actually no responses." You see how confusing that could be?

You understand what I mean? I mean he has an inner conflict, they call it. The psyrologists call it an inner conflict.

So you just take your chance. What is this fellow going to do? Well, there is no telling what he is going to do.

Now, in the view of a great deal of bad control in the world, perhaps it's a good thing to respond so randomly and unpredictably that nobody can ever do anything. Now, that's a solution too: Be so unpredictable that nobody can ever really get around you because he never quite knows what you're going to do.

You know, there's nothing as predictable as an unpredictable person. The only thing it adds up to is a person who is unpredictable. So you can't do anything about them, so it's okay to shoot them. That's usually the government's adjudication. As governments go downhill, they eventually say, "Well, you can't control the people anyway, so you might as well punish them."

So all this combination of the five things winds up is that the person gets . . this we can say for sure . . gets into a games condition with almost anything. That you can be sure of . . that the person will get into a games condition with almost anything. And you will find him denying and being denied and so forth. And if you don't know what the fellow's case is, you wouldn't even be able to predict what kind of a games condition he was in perpetually.

But, of course, after you've taken his case apart, he isn't like that anymore, so there you are. Isn't that an interesting thing, that the moment you find out what man is all about, it is because you've taken man apart in an auditing session. And of course, if you've taken him apart in an auditing session, he no longer reacts that way.

So the problem of "What is man all about and how will he react?" then dead ends at this point. Yeah, we can say, "Yes, we know what man is all about." In any given case, it then ceases to be of any use to us.

It's fascinating, you know. I mean we know everything that he's all about. All right, at the moment we find out, so does he and he's no longer like that. So therefore it's of no use to anybody at all. He's some other way now. He's on his second goal combination.

Now, these five are in domination. They are dominated by life and are dominating life and it is some kind of a system and a game and they add up to a random series of games that the individual plays that he is no longer capable of playing and that he doesn't like to play anymore.

So they actually add up to a denial of a game. So actually he can't play or relax or have a game because he's in a games condition. He's in an overwhelmed state.

All right. We look at this and we see then, that the low percentage of clearing, the very low percentage that we were getting, you see, must have stacked up to this: that we had a fortuitous combination, almost by accident on the case with Routine 3. It was a fortuitous combination.

We actually did get the person's goal. That we knew. That was real. We had that, that's fine. All right. Now, we might have gotten the opposition terminal for the pc's own terminal and we might have gotten the pc's terminal. And because there's a conflict between these two things, we might have gotten some other terminal. See, we might have gotten some other subordinate terminal to the opposition goal or something See, we got one goal and then we pick it up and because it acts like the goal is no reason it is the pc's terminal.

If we've got the goal and its E-Meter reading and reaction, there are still four more things to get. Almost any one of these things could produce something that looked like the pc's terminal. That's interesting, isn't it?

Now, you start grinding away and getting desperate and getting your rudiments out or something like that and the pc is no longer in excellent communication with you and what do you find happening Well, you in desperation are buying anything and in desperation the pc is selling anything, so of course, you're liable to come up with anything under the sun except the pc's right terminal on 3A.

So there must have been a lot of terminals that could be run, but not to Clear. See, lots of terminals that could be run without . . . And they're just the terminals that are subordinate to these first five items. But if you've got the wrong one of these and were running the wrong one, the person practically could be audited on and on and on and on and on. And he'd feel better and he'd know that was it and it would make sense to his case and everything. And he'd just go on and on and on, that's all.

So your percentage of actual Clears coming out of any given body of people would be a low percentage. What it is, I don't know. Maybe it was 20 percent, maybe it was 15 percent, something like that. But, you know me and I have never settled for these low percentages. Yes, benefit cases . . oh, yeah, yeah, yeah. Well, that's fine. We can benefit cases. The number of cases that we can benefit just willy-nilly from here on out are . . it's a very high percentage. We can do an awful lot with an awful lot of cases without knowing anything about the rest of this because we've been doing it for years actually.

But now, when it goes to go for broke and a Clear for somebody, straight across the boards, if we did a terribly gentle, very exact job, perhaps, of sorting out the person's facsimiles . . as was done so many years ago under a very, very high level of ARC and a tremendous amount of gradient scales, you know, moving them up the line . . we probably would have triggered our way through this without seeing any of the parts, see? We probably could have gone through it without noticing any of the parts. It sounds strange, but we probably could have. But regardless of that, we're taking a tightrope walk these days in Routine 3D across the Grand Canyon, which lies between life as it was lived back then and Clear and it is a tightrope walk.

There is only at this moment one process which could be reliably counted upon to do this exact thing There's really only one that you could just count on like that. Bang! You'd say, well, if we got these parts, we're there, see. We're at that point. And we can count on that process. Now, with clearing under 3 . . Routine 3, we could not count on that process to absolutely carry every case away through to Clear. I'm talking empirically now, because look at the number of cases that were started on Routine 3 and look at the small percentage of Clears that resulted. That's the only type of percentages that mean anything to me. It's not what I hope, it is what is.

All right. Now, if we can lift the sights on this, wonderful. All right. Now, Routine 3D . . I've already been accused of underselling Routine 3D because I haven't really been making very much noise about it. I have been too busy. I've been too busy getting it checked out, cross-checking and researched and so on. I took a look at, well, past cases for sure and present cases, and realized that we were working against a deadline . . only about ten days ago . . and I realized that we were working against a heavy deadline. And I had a bunch of background information that I'd been sort of looking at, you know and fitting around and thinking we were getting along all right and so forth and I was not necessarily taking my time, but I just saw this and said, "Hey, wait a minute. A lot of these people are going to be leaving here in the middle of December and some of them won't go away Clear, not at the rate they're going now. Student auditing is not very fast. Little errors get made and so forth. And the way some of these cases are running right this minute, I just wouldn't bet on it too much. It isn't a good show."

So, I went out and got several tons of coal and poured it on the ba . . the front burner and the back burner and turned on the blower system, heated it up to about 31,000 degrees centigrade and pulled the rest of it all together and got a fast look at it and Suzie can tell you this; it was a terrible mess weekend before last. And checked it out during the ensuing week. I didn't check it out because I knew I had it by Monday morning It had been waiting there for a long time. Did spend the rest of the week checking it out and actually trying to get ahead of you on commands and I'm just about that far ahead of you.

And those of you which are marching right up to it right about now can breathe easier. But there's an awful problem that lies on the middle of the tightrope and that is where all these five elements come

together in a bunch and you call it the Goals Problem Mass. Technical term; you might as well get used to it.

Those who have run 3D have seen a Prehav level move up the tone arm. Your Prehav level moves up the tone arm. Then you get a new Prehav level and it backs down and then raises up again and sticks. Have you noticed that? That's the way the old Prehav Scale has done on Routine 2 and Routine 3. That was the way it did. Now, the second I got the modifier, it started moving up, clank. It moved up much more rapidly on the Prehav Scale, very rapidly.

And now with 3D, you sometimes don't get more than one or two brackets run before the tone arm goes up and sticks. That's fascinating, isn't it?

As a matter of fact, if you were very alert, you could see it stick on two commands, just like that. Bang! Bang! And it already looks like it's there and it doesn't do much moving on from there on out.

Well, now, that gives you some index of the speed with which we're dealing

On Routine 3, it took hours and hours and hours and days and days and days and weeks and weeks and weeks, sometimes, to flatten a Prehav level until the tone arm went up and stuck. And then we have to get a new level.

You've already seen this in action, remember? Took it quite a while. You . . I don't think you've even ever seen a stuck arm because we stopped running it before it stuck. But it took a long time to flatten one of those levels, didn't it?

Now, if you'd flattened the level all the way out, it would have gone up and stuck. Been doing that since February, down in South Africa, one of the earliest observations of this. Well, why is that? Well, some kind of a mass moves in that isn't being as-ised. And you run this level and it as-ises all of that level there is in the mass and then the mass closes in on the pc. Thud!

Well, with 3A, if you've just done 3A and nothing else, you still would have gotten this stuck phenomena and you would have seen it, but it probably would have happened in two or three or four sessions. And now it happens in two or three commands. Now, you get relative speed, see. It's getting awfully fast as far as the run is concerned.

Now, what is this thing? What is this thing . . the Goals Problem Mass?

Well, now, I could tell you an awful lot of theory behind this, but I won't bother to. I'll draw you a picture. I won't bother to draw it on the blackboard. Draw it in your mind.

What's a problem? A problem is postulate-counter-postulate, terminal-counter-terminal, force counter-force. It's one thing versus another thing, isn't it? That's a problem.

You go home, you have an argument with your wife. She says, "We're going to the movies." You say, "I'm not going to the movies. We're not going to the movies." All right. There it is. As long as she is saying, "We are not going to the movies," and you're saying, "We're going to the movies," or vice versa, neither one of you go anyplace. You just stand there and natter. That's it.

So there's your problem and you've got this thing in balance because you've got two forces or two ideas which are interlocked of comparable magnitude and the thing stops right there.

All right. Now, with these two things, one stuck against the other, you get a sort of a timelessness. It floats in time. Timelessness goes along with this.

We have the idea of democracy in the United States and communism in Russia. Now, the only reason that ever adds up to any kind of a problem that anybody can do anything with, the only reason it never adds up, is simply of course, is because the United States started the philosophy of communism in 1776, and is a sucker for it.

You hear the communist slogans and so forth. All you have to do is go up to the Capitol and just walk through and look at them on the plaques. They're all there: equal rights, equality, socialism, fraternity. All these things are there.

You go over to Paris and you look at the slogans of the French Revolution. You'll find they're all there.

The Russians have always been about 150 years behind the times and they have a hell of a time catching up. Always slow, always slow. They finally learned how to do ballet about a hundred years after the French and they're always late this way, see. It took them some eighty years to pick up communism from a German in the first place. You see, they're late.

And you actually don't get much of a problem-counter-problem. There isn't really a problem-counter-problem. If they all got together and argued about it... A 1776 patriot in the vicinity of Boston, arguing with a 1961 communist in the vicinity of Moscow, would have a hell of a time. They couldn't find anyplace they were in disagreement except the Bostonian would be trying to tell the Russian he was going a little bit too far and he was being a purist about it. That's just about as far as the argument could proceed.

And this would be an interesting scramble. They couldn't find out where they were having a problem and that is the difficulty with world situation today. They really are not sure where they've got a problem. All they are sure of is that there are two forces in opposition. The Russian forces are in opposition to the American forces or the NATO forces or the English forces, don't you see? We can be sure of that.

I don't . . the reason why I don't think it'll ever come to much is there's no basic postulate-problem difficulty behind it. For instance, England of course, sowed her seeds of destruction about 1100 and something, with the Magna Carta. If you ever . . nobody in England, of course, knows very much about the Magna Carta. They talk about it a lot, but they never look into the background of the Magna Carta. But that was a real wild-eyed Red document when it was first dreamed up. That was a wild one.

And perhaps wisely, nobody ever, you know, kept a copy of it. But do you know that was to turn all the land back to the serfs, and it was all going to be socialism and so forth. And the people that walked up there to that field to push a pistol against somebody's head . . I forgot who it was, gunpowder hadn't been invented yet, but you get the allegory. And by George, they had these . . these terrific ideas. It was equality and there was socialism and all of that sort of thing. And there was going to be equal justice for all and everybody was going to be equal one way or the other and the nobles sold them out. The nobles sold everybody out. The nobles settled more or less for their fare. And they didn't settle for the serfs' and villains' side of the picture. But the serfs and villains were there in the background. And what they expected to hear that day as the final pronunciamento was vastly different than the pronunciamento which was finally signed and read. Because they expected to hear that, "Slaves, break your chains and that is it." And they didn't hear that.

Now, whether this story of the Magna Carta is accurate or not awaits until one of you who were there gives us the dope, straight. I wasn't there at the time; I was busy elsewhere. But I'm indebted to the story of the Magna Carta and what it was all about to the late George Wichelow and he was a great student of human liberty and human rights and he used to reel this thing off by the yard and so forth.

And I don't know where he dug up all this history, but it was sure interesting. We stood up there on that field one day, and he was showing me where they all sat and what they all said and all this sort of thing and so forth. And I could get the idea of old George there, right up there in the front rank, you know, looking meaner than hell. He really had it taped.

But, anyway, the facts of the case are that these political philosophies that are being brooded about in our 1961, at the moment, are not particularly in much disagreement. The last political philosophy there was disagreement with everybody went by the boards in 1945 when a certain chap on the other side of the channel over here took the finger off his number. I've forgotten his name. Schicklgruber, I think it was . . house painter.

And he didn't get the word. He didn't get the word. The philosophy of pure force could no longer exist in this world. He thought it could and a few million dead men later, why, people decided he was wrong.

So there was an active force and there was war. Why? Because you had an ideology of the superiority of a race and the magnitude and glory of force and "the chosen people" sort of an idea of where the rest of the world was going to be enslaved in some aristocratic feudal system, somehow or another, by the Wehrmacht. This philosophy was no longer acceptable.

Well, I remember the Germans back from Roman times. They . . you'd go up there, you know, and they'd be wearing Roman costumes or something of the sort. Oh, they'd be out of date, you hadn't seen them in Rome for a century, you know. They were always behind the times. That's another crew that always . . always a little bit old or a little bit late. Old-fashioned, you know. You go up there, the girls are wearing the wrong hats every time. And they, however, carried over that many centuries. That's sort of an exaggeration.

But the philosophy of pure force . . the philosophy of . . what the devil was his name? He was some fellow that was sick all the time . . his name wasn't Zarathustra, but you get the idea.

Female voice: Nietzsche.

I don't know what his name was. There's no reason to send it down to history because I don't think he could write.

Anyway, perhaps it was unfortunate for Hitler that he could read, but that philosophy had long since gone out. And that philosophy posed against the philosophy of equality and decency to your fellow man, equal chances and equal rights under law, couldn't live because this other philosophy, as I'm trying to show you, isn't Russian, isn't English, isn't these things. It's something that's been around for a long time and actually was inculcated into this part of the world by the Romans.

The Romans had two distinct philosophies in their political network and that's why they were always at war. They had the philosophy of equality and justice along with the philosophy of total dominance . . "get thy neck bent over so I can get mine heel upon it, crunch." You recognize that.

The Roman while spreading equal rights under law, Roman justice, the rights of citizenship, the rights of property, the mechanisms of government, at the same time dragged along with him . . like the carcass of a rotting horse hauled along back of a wagon . . slavery. And it was incompatible. He himself had never digested his own political philosophies and he couldn't live with what he had. And his states he created one after the other, each one went down because there were too many violent counterpoises which could be launched here. And Christianity was a crystallization of the Roman philosophy of equality and socialism and that's why it eventually conquered the Roman state.

Up to that time, equality and decency to your fellow man was rather counterpoised by total cruelty, total barbarism about your fellow man and specialized justice and specialized cliques and so forth. So, you had a problem within the state. You had two active philosophies which are counterbalanced and the Roman, of course, could never settle his political affairs. He might make an empire, but he actually could never do . . make up his mind, "What philosophy are we ruling by here." He always had something else, don't you see?

And then the philosophy of Christianity won out and has come down to us and is the philosophy of Russia today; only they call it communism.

Anyway, and we've got another Christian philosophy today, and we don't know what we'd call that. But it's definitely . . if you study the philosophy of the early Christian, you will find that community property and all the various things which they worship in Russia today are early Christian principles and actually made their emergence on this planet at about that time of Christ. So the Russian is awful late. God, I wish somebody would bring them up to present time.

Anyway, there's no potential war because there's no disagreement. Now, most Russian practices are subversive. Well, we can disagree with that. We use them ourselves. They use blackmail and they do various things which are not quite decent in conduct of human activities and that sort of thing

We could argue about some of these ideas. We could say they go too far. We could say the cult of the personality goes too far and that sort of thing. But actually we're protesting against things which we ourselves, in the western world, have held to be true for the last couple of thousand years. Fascinating, isn't it? We'd be fighting our own philosophy if we fought communism too hard. You notice, however, that the most dissenting voices against communism are those who are . . say that pure communism goes too far. Have you heard that? You've heard that? Yeah, it's quite common. That is of course the only real postulate could be launched against communism to make a problem. Because they go too far.

If the fellow's able and gets a name for something, of being a good clown or something like that, why, you have to shoot him or something, you know. That seems a little bit dull. But, anyway, if you extend any socialism just a couple of thoughts further than the existing socialism, you'd find out that's what you'd have to do.

You couldn't allow anybody to have a name. They'd all have a number. I mean we've had a famous English writer here for many, many years. The late H. G. Wells has given us some marvelous things. There's Aldous Huxley, The Brave New World, things of this character. There have been more cracks made at the supersocialization of things, don't you see.

So you're arguing by degrees. And do you know that you really can't have much of an argument by degrees. You can't have much of an argument by degrees. You'll see two fellows; they arrive on a corner. One says, "Let's walk half a mile."

And the other one says, "No, let's walk a mile."

And they start arguing about it and they'll walk three-quarters of a mile. Because the understanding is incipient in the difficulty. In other words, we've already got an agreement that they're going to walk, you know. It's just a question of how far. So there isn't much of a war involved. But we get one fellow . . we . . he says, "Now, the thing we ought to do is stay right here on this corner and that's it and not move another foot."

And the other fellow comes along and he says, "Well, the thing we ought to do is keep running around the block and the only safe thing to do is keep running around the block and always be in motion and never stand still."

Well, these two fellows will . . they're having trouble too because their point of view is a little bit distant. But nevertheless they'll get into an argument of some kind or other. Each one will wind up saying the other one's crazy and there's no fundamental agreement on what they're doing and they'll be very upset about it.

Do you see that? It takes an argument of some kind to take this. All right.

The wife says, "We're not going to go to the pictures."

And the husband says, "We are going to go to the pictures."

Now, you've got an argument. They can communicate because it's about the pictures. That's the only reason they can communicate in an argument, because it has a common meeting ground.

All right, you go through various things and you'll find these problems come up around gross differences of opinion. And all problems arise around gross differences of opinion or gross vectors of ideas. Vectors of ideas is a better thing here for your understanding of this than anything else.

You've got one fellow who says, "Go north," and the other fellow says, "Go south." Well, of course, they'll walk apart and never meet again and that's all right.

But supposing one is standing north of the other one and south of the other one and they're directly standing in each other's paths and one is going to go north and the other is going to go south, and not . . and their modifiers in both cases would be "and not budge an inch out of my path." Oh, you've got a nice problem there because you've got two ideas and now you've added mass against mass. See, they're not just standing and nattering They're in each other's road.

One is going to go this way. The other one is going to go that way. And if they move in the respective direction where they think they should be going, they're going to run into each other. Now, you've got the idea is different and the mass is going in different directions.

And when those two masses collide, if each one were trying to move at the rate of one hundred foot-pounds forward, they'd just stop there forever. If nothing else unsettled that situation, each man, one trying to go south through the man who was trying to go north and the one trying to go north through the man that's trying to go south and each one of them trying to walk forward at the rate of one hundred foot-pounds of thrust, well, it's going to stop right there. That's it. The trail is ended.

And they get an idea that that time lasts forever because there's nothing ever unbalances it. So it takes the mass and the idea to make a real problem . . the only point I'm trying to make.

You can have the mass in some disagreement or headed in some direction and so on and the other mass coming in the other direction, they hit, but there's no ideas around. Of course, there's nothing to make it hang up. It's just a couple of pieces of mass. It happens all the time. Good heavens, stars a thousand times the size of Earth have hit stars in this universe, but nobody around and no planets depending on them or anything else and so the astronomers noted down someplace that there was a big flash. That was it. So, there was a big flash. So what?

It's far more important in this universe that Mamie Glutz has in her mind a force that is going to go north and a force that is going to go south; and the force that is going to go north finds the force that is going to go south in its path; and the force that is going to go south has the idea it's going to go north; and the force that is going to go north has the idea that it's going to go south because that's the way it will continue to be to the end of the whole universe.

And that's what is known as a Goals Problem Mass.

Do you see that? That's two equal lock-ups. Crunch!

Now, let's run a bunch of unsettling factors into the man who was going to go south and into the man who was going to go north. And now, let's add some other factors into these fellows so as to unbalance the hundred footpounds of thrust each one is furnishing against each other.

Now, of course, 101 foot-pounds of thrust will cause the man who was trying to go south to actually back northward and you no longer have a perfectly balanced problem. So the second that the person who is trying to go south finds himself about to be pushed north, what is his first action? It's to add enough weight to try to overcome the fellow who is going north. So he puts on a 102 foot-pounds of thrust and then the fellow going north tries to . . south tries to put on the other 103. And then the fellow going north puts on 104 and the fellow going south puts on 105, and . . and so on. And it gets to be a little teeter, see. They're just teetering at each other.

In any mind, on any central issue, there are two different ideas which are available at first to the auditor. Let me qualify it like that because this isn't the whole ideas . . of ideas that are in the mind. Actually, there's quite a few of these things in the mind.

It was like I was telling you the other day, there's a thousand skins on the onion, there are a million, billion skins on the onion. You can take them apart a lot of skins at a time. And the first Goals Problem Mass that is available to the auditor for auditing is that one which has the visible goal.

Now, all that's visible of this thing is just the goal that the pc says is his goal. It finally comes out to be by assessment the pc's goal.

Now, if you've ever seen a goals list that ran 350 goals which is a very common pc's goals list, you would see that this goals list might have been, any one of them, the road in. Until assessed, the Goals Problem Mass might have been located by any one of 350 different tags, until you assess it. So you see the number of complexity. Because, do you know the pc didn't know that either? See, the pc was . . is in ignorance of all this. He's doing it all and he's in total ignorance of it, which is quite amazing.

So he's trying to do this. All right, we look at this Goals Problem Mass and we find out that it could have had any one of 350 possible roads into it and by assessment we finally find out what it is!

All right, now, all we've got is the pc's goal. Now, that is idea one. That is the fellow with the idea that he's going to go south, you see.

All right. Now, why don't we at once . . why don't we at once find, then, the opposition goal. Shouldn't that be number two? No, you've overlooked something. You have a pc's body in the auditing chair. You have already found the gross terminal that has this goal. Only you don't know what to call it yet, see? You've already found it.

So, actually, you didn't find the goal as the first action. The action occurred before the auditing session.

You got a pc and put him in the chair, see? Well, you found something there. There's some mass connected with it. Now, you'd better get some counterbalancing mass in a hurry because you found this person's goal. Now, of course, if you found the other goal . . you'll find this in experience, too, as you winnow these things out, you'll find out that it's almost impossible to get the opposite goal before you get the terminal. You've got to get the opposition terminal. We've got to get something that matches up to the pc mass.

All right. And then we find out what is the opposition goal.

All right, now, we've got the clear-cut picture, got the clear-cut picture. A somethingness . . a valence actually, undiscovered, but nevertheless there and observable by this time to both the pc and the auditor . . is trying to move south with a certain idea of moving south. And it is . . something else is apparently present which is trying to move north through the pc. And this something else that is present happens to be an International Harvester. See, that's the opposition terminal, see. It's an International Harvester. We never knew it before now, but that's what it is. It's what it assessed out to be. That's what's trying to move the opposite direction.

Good. All right. That's fine. And now let's find out what the opposition harvester is trying to do and we eventually do a big assessment. And we find out that, according to the pc, its goal is to, of course, just to move south. To move south. That is that simple.

It's going to move south. He's going to move north. All right. Fine. Didn't matter which way it was. They're going to move toward each other and it's going to lock up. One goal is going to lock up against the other goal and one terminal, not yet found, is going to lock up against the other terminal.

Now we go back and find out what little piece did the pc add to overcome the counterpressure and we get the modifier.

Now, that's the additives. That's the one pound that went on top of the hundred foot-pound, you see? That was his new idea, Well, if he announced this idea, then the International Harvester would move backwards, see? Get the point?

So he's walking against the machine. The machine is coming against him and they were both balanced up. The ideas are both balanced. The force they're using is both balanced and at this moment, the pc with wonderful insight adds a little push in that direction.

Now, you know that there's a modifier to the opposition goal. Did you know the opposition goal modifies?

Now, why don't you find it? It's not the pc's goal, that's all. It's not the pc's modifier. You found enough pieces already. And actually it'll go on and on and on. You could do this assessment for modifier to the pc's goal and modifier to the opposition goal and modifier to the pc's goal and modifier to the opposition goal and modifier to the pc's goal and they'd probably go up to something that's looked like the new goals list. And it might go into hundreds because, of course, every time the pc is trying to go north and every time the machine has tried to move south, new ideas were added, to make the passage. But they're just stack-ups. You got to draw a halt someplace or another and where you really have to go is you do have to find the modifier because you need the modifier, otherwise, you're not going to find the terminal. The pc's terminal cannot be found without his modifier. But the opposition terminal can be found without the goal.

But, if you assess too much and too many, if you assess too much and too many opposition, you're going to get the wind blowing

If you don't believe it sometime, run the opposition terminal on the Prehav Scale on just one assessment and ask the pc how he feels. Well, that's what? That's a whole seventy or eighty repetitions of the opposition terminal, one right after the other.

Well, it's the found terminal, see. It wasn't odd terminals . . differentiation. You're saying to him, "Man going south. Man going south. Man going south. Man going south. Man going south. Man going south." And after a while, he sort of gets the idea of the bzuu, bzuu! He's losing He actually will start to kind of back up. He can feel the wind go past his ears. You know, uuuuuuh, "What's this, what's this?" you know. Uuuuuuuuuh.

It isn't necessary. It'll all run out.

Now, you are indebted to the gross values of auditing. In other words, auditing these days, done well with the rudiments in, can handle an awful lot of additives. You do the simple, central mechanics and the additives fly off like a Roman candle. There's nothing much to it, you see.

If you had to run everything that actually should be run, of course, you would run the entire lifetime of the individual as that terminal against every opposition that he ever encountered and every thought he ever thank and every dinner he ever ate and every lunch he ever ate and every breakfast he ever ate and every bed he ever slept in and every time he'd ever hurt his finger and every time he ever wum, and every time he ever wum and wum-wum, and he'd have to know everything there was to know on the whole track all the way along the line for the last 200 trillion years.

Now, how long do you think that would take to clear him? In view of the fact that he can be shot in one second and if he had been shot and you were running it as an engram, it'd take you five or six hours, I'd say the factor was several thousand times the actual time length. That's how much . . how long auditing would take.

Let's say it's ten thousand times as long to audit out a wound as to be shot, see? So that'd be ten thousand times 200 trillion years is how long it'd take to run out the pc's bank. Now you get some kind of an idea what I've been tackling here.

The only thing that's got the bank messed up is the Goals Problem Mass. That's all that's got the bank messed up.

All right, enough of this. You walk into the Goals Problem Mass, clank. The moment that you ask the pc for his goal, you'll sometimes see a pc's tone arm on some pcs start up at that point and it goes up . . clank, brrp. Then come back down a little bit, and you change the thing and brrrp, clank, brrrp, boom. Rudiments go a little bit out, up goes the tone arm, clank. Sort of sticky. Then all of a sudden you pin the goal down and it sort of frees up. Well, actually you move them closer to the Goals Problem Mass than they had been before. But you moved them closer with more understanding

So although they're standing closer, they've got a better tone arm and needle. Interesting. But remember, you did move them closer to the Goals Problem Mass and therefore their tone arm will now go higher or lower and misbehave worse and stick heavier. You make an error now on rudiments and of course they . . it gets much stickier. Interesting, isn't it?

Now, as we go up the line on this and we find the opposition terminal, we of course, are that much closer to the Goals Problem Mass. Ummmm. Ah, but because we know about it, he can stand that much closer to it without being burned. We just get our needle disbehaves a little worse, occasionally when a rudiment goes out . . why, it all of a sudden . . . Have you noticed a pc after you've been auditing him awhile, the needle gets awfully sticky if something goes out and the tone arm sort of misbehaves and goes higher and then usually will go lower and then frees up quicker.

He gets worse and gets better faster. Well, that's because he's standing up closer to this Goals Problem Mass, see? You've got his attention coming into where his attention is really stuck.

All right. Well, he's much better off when you find the opposition terminal, that's for sure of that. Everything is fine. He's also standing another few feet closer to the blast furnace, when in view of the fact that the total fire in the furnace consists of not knowing what's in the furnace, that he knows a little bit about it, makes it possible for him to do so.

And then you find the opposition goal and you move him a little closer to the furnace, closer to the Goals Problem Mass, actually and you can lock up his needle quicker and free it and lock it up and it goes freer and it's been drifting freer and then locks up easier. There's nothing more horrible than somebody who hasn't any idea of what's wrong with him. Doesn't even know that he ever even has any trouble in life. The tone arm is always at 3.0. Needle never moves much. Give the cans a squeeze and the needle rises. Nothing wrong with him. He doesn't need any auditing. He doesn't know where he is. He doesn't know what he's doing.

Well, with this individual you could just hit him over the head with brickbats and you would never get his tone arm to do anything but sit right there at 3.0. Right there . . there it is.

You can ask him the most challenging Sec Check questions. Never moves. That's your dead thetan case. Now, when you get this guy wheeling along the line a little bit, don't start worrying because he's got a high tone arm. Well, his tone arm will go up, clank! after you've found two or three of these elements in 3D. It's liable to be way up and real stuck. Then the . . he looks at the other wall and comes down. I mean that could happen, see?

But actually, it really doesn't happen until you get into the Prehav run, which I am trying to actually cover in this lecture for you.

Now, what occurs? You're moving him closer to the mass. There is an actual mass. It is a measurable problem. It is . . does have mass. It does have existence in space. True, it's the pc's space, not the physical universe's space, but it has an existence in its own space. It is contactable. You can measure the density. And that is what the E-Meter is doing, is measuring the density of the Goals Problem Mass and that is all the E-Meter is doing.

Now, I invite you sometime to conduct this experiment. Get some pc who has a sensibility to mental masses. This is the bulk of your pcs. It's not pcs who are way downhill and "Oh, well, I don't think I ever want any auditing because actually there's nothing much you can do." Don't get one of those kind. Get somebody that has an idea and he can see a picture, he can see something of this sort.

All right. Now, ask him something like this: "Have you ever had a problem?"

"Well, yes, I had a problem. I had a problem with my mother."

“All right. That’s fine. Now, tell me a solution to that problem. Thank you. Tell me a solution to that problem. Thank you. Tell me a solution to that problem. Thank you. Now, do you see any masses in your vicinity?”

“Oooooh, as a matter of fact, I do. There’s . . . Yeah, yeah, yeah.”

“Well, where is . . where is this mass?”

“Oh, I don’t know.” And so on and so on and so on.

“Well, tell me a solution to that problem.”

“What problem?”

“Well, this problem with your mother. Where is the problem now, by the way?”

“Oh, it’s out there about twelve feet away from me.”

Very interesting What is this problem doing with a location in relationship to him twenty years after and two thousand miles away.

What is this problem doing there? But, it’s there.

You say, “All right. Now, tell me a solution to that problem with your mother. Thank you. Tell me a solution to that problem with your mother. Thank you. Now, where is that mass?”

“Well, as a matter of fact, it’s out here about five feet.”

You say, “Good. Thank you very much. Now, tell me a solution of that problem with your mother. All right. Tell me a solution of that problem with your mother. Thank you. Tell me a solution of that problem with your mother. Thank you. Now, where is this problem?”

“Well, as a matter of fact, it’s right there. It’s right on the end of my nose. It’s very funny you mention that because it’s come right in. It’s sort of a mass, and it’s right there on the end of my nose.”

You say, “Well, that’s fine. Tell me a solution to that problem. Tell me a solution.”

Now, if you were a psychiatrist, you’d keep that up for the rest of the day. And you say, “Where is the thing now?”

And he says, “As a matter of fact, it’s sitting inside my nose. It’s back here in my cheekbones and it’s awfully tight. There’s something tight in there.”

You say, “Good. Now, think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Thank you. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Thank you. Where is this problem?”

“It’s right here at the end of my nose.”

“Good. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Thank you. Think of a problem of comparable magnitude. Where is it now?”

“Well, it’s out there about five feet,” the pc will tell you.

“All right.”

And you run “think of a problem of comparable magnitude” and he’ll finally tell you it’s out there twelve feet away. It’s out there one mile away. It’s out there about two thousand miles away. Well, it’s back

where it came from. Because you kept running that, providing your rudiments were in, you didn't keep kicking him in the shins or give him electric shocks or back treatments at the same time.

Anyhow, we got a situation there where we can move these masses in and out. You can actually move masses in and out by addressing the subject of problems and solutions.

That's very important. That's a very well-known and very old datum in Scientology: that you can move problems and masses in and out with problems and solutions. You can move masses. The more you solve the problem, the closer the mass gets. What is more, you approximate the problem the further it moves away.

Unknowns do the same thing. This is about . . what was it? I think it was about 1956, late 55, 56. I remember up in London, I remember going over and talking about it at the Coach and Horses one day over a nice steak. Anyhow, and the civic planners have now swept all that away and I don't think you can get a steak in London. Well, that's progress.

Anyway, the whole of this mechanism is of vast interest to you in clearing because all you're handling is the Goals Problem Mass. And what is that mass? That's the mass of the pc, the pc's terminal, the opposition terminal, the opposition goal, the pc's goal, the modifier and now, every other force that has been added in to help each other out. And of course, that can add up to hundreds of each item. Hundreds! And until you looked at the thing, you'd have actually thousands of items in a total confusion and you wouldn't know what to do with any one of the items, but it'd be a nice big, black mass. That's all. It's just a conglomerate something or other, see?

And everything is pushing and everything is resisting and everything is pushing in the opposite direction and being resisted in the opposite direction. And it's all just locked up just as nice as anything you ever saw. Thud!

There it is. Nothing is going to go in any direction, and everything is being helped from going in any other direction but the direction it's not going Pc's personality.

Now, you've got these . . all these factors. And if you've got these five factors, you've got the basic factors . . the only factors necessary to take a problem apart. But you've got tremendous factors that are added to these fives. Each one of the five might be an army, but it has a . . scores of auxiliaries. Each factor has scores of auxiliaries. And if you tried to look this thing over on just a quantitative basis, you'd never tackle it. The pc never has. He's never dared. All the pc's ever done is have trouble with it.

All right. You get too close to the Goals Problem Mass, all sorts of odd things occur. The pc feels like he's getting his skull pushed in. Maybe he was upset. And before you're running 3D, he's going to be plenty upset, at various points, in a sort of a puzzled way. So it takes confidence here and it takes an auditor's smooth auditing in order to get over the jumps.

Because what happens? When you got the five, he feels much better. But he's liable to be dramatizing any one of the five. Now that they're live, he's still close to the Goals Problem Mass. Any kind of an ARC break on any one of the particular subjects is liable to throw him into a dramatization of that item.

Of course, you've got him at a loss at this momentary stage. You know exactly which item he's dramatizing if you know his 3D. At least you can tell him, "Well, all right. Let's not be a . . " whatever it is.

But there's no sense in doing that and it's accusative, it's liable to cave him in and cost you several hours of auditing because he'll eventually come around and tell you, "Well, all I have done is cost myself five hours of auditing" You know?

But he actually can go in and out on these various items and he goes flicker-flack. And he'll dramatize these things and he'll get these tremendous ideas. And he'll get up in the morning . . he's got this awful compulsion, you see, to eat cider buns, but they don't exist, you know and ya-uuuuuuuh. And he'll realize a few minutes later, an hour or so later, "Oh, well, naturally, a bun vender. They have people who

buy buns from a bun vender and my opposition terminal is a bun vender. Oh, well, it's obvious. Well, how silly I am. I wish I could certainly find a cider bun."

It isn't in a very high state of key-out. That's because it's closer in to the Goals Problem Mass, so it's actually being enforced at this stage.

It's less than it has ever been. Do you understand? It's less than it's ever been, but that doesn't mean that it never gets dramatized, it can be pretty soon.

It's easier to get a pc into session and easier for a pc to go out of session, just as it's easier to free up the needle and easier to stick it up. You find a much more active picture going on here. It is not so comfortably status quo.

Now, let's say, for the last many thousand years this Goals Problem Mass has been in a marvelous state of status quo. Pc left it alone. It made him dramatize it and it was riding along It was all in perfect counterbalance. Time, what was the time? The time of it, of course, was the time of it. That was time. There was no other time than the time of it.

And it coasts along forever. It endures forever. Nothing could affect it. There you are. You had an armored citadel. Any given situation, the pc had . . had his no choice of doing one of five things, modified of course, by the hundreds of things appended to any one of the five. Fascinating, isn't it?

The pc never had to think, never had to live, never had to be there, never had to enjoy anything Had lots of fun getting in his own road. Spent endless hours trying to understand himself. The advantages of having one of these things are absolutely uncountable.

Every time you decide that you better walk down to the corner and get a little bit of fresh air, why, you find yourself sitting more deeply in the chair.

Say, "What happened to me? That's a funny thing. Oh, well, that's life, I guess. The brain, the brain is what's doing it."

I think the psychologist has got these things so heavily that they've got them inner superimposed inside the skull in some fashion. I think that is why the brain is.

But now I'm not talking and haven't been talking about an imaginary item. The thing is a sensing item. It is an item which can be sensed. This thing can be experienced.

You plaster one of these things all over a pc's chest or face or stomach sometime and then try to convince him there's nothing there. He feels this heavy pressure, he'll tell you about the pressure, terrible pressure. Pressure.

And you say, "Well, there's nothing there really. It's just your imagination. What you should . . what you should realize is it is best of all possible worlds where there is nothing but mind and space and infinite mind and there is only infinite mind." Well, you could convince him of this, perhaps, perhaps. If you deflected his attention so that he didn't feel it.

But the next time he was walking down the street, there'd be a slight wind or a car would backfire suddenly and he'd have this right back where it is again and you'd have to tell him with more duress, "Well, pray harder to God." Now, that would work just so far because a certain percentage of these fellows had God as part of the Goals Problem Mass and where you had that, you almost slaughtered him.

See, maybe God was the opposition terminal. And you say . . he'd say, "Pray to God. Well, maybe I'd better pray to God." And all of a sudden he feels very degraded, very crushed and degraded and he can't tell why.

“Religion does a great deal for many people and many things and they’re very happy about religion. Why shouldn’t I be? I guess I just haven’t said my prayers right. All right, I’ll try again tonight,” you see. And he gets up the next morning and feels three times as degraded. Nobody could figure out why.

All right. That Goals Problem Mass is a mass; it does exist. And as you get 3D, you’re actually taking apart from a distance the component parts of the Goals Problem Mass as it most intimately relates to the beginning of the onion skins that you’re trying to peel off.

That’s the first series, and of course, it’s much harder to locate. Now, that we can locate it at all is due to the fact that it is an electronic mass. The mental electronics go into its composition. And, of course, when we tick something in it, why, we get a vibration, see and it-shows up on the E-Meter. And that’s how you do an assessment.

The pc could never live in the middle of it, let me tell you. He’d just fall to pieces. His skull would fall off or something It’s not that the thing is dangerous. But when he got in there, he couldn’t tell you what he was looking at because all he would do . . would dramatize everything that was in it. And then he’d dramatize all the auxiliaries of everything that was in it, too. Well, but he can stand off and with good rudiments in and good ARC, he can assess like mad.

Now, why do your rudiments go out? Well, the auditor, in some way or another. . . We’ve got the various reasons, the things that have to be settled out so that he doesn’t experience this, like all the rudiments, of course. You get your rudiments in, why, the auditor is not totally identified with these Goals Problem Mass. He’s got it separated out. So the auditor can sit there and audit the pc, until he does something to restimulate the Goals Problem Mass.

And we know the various things that are the most heaviest restimulators on any case. And when these go out, part of the Goals Problem Mass goes in and it can get sufficiently heavily charged or in, that your meter stops reading. And you can’t assess, that’s all. You just . . well, it’s something like: “Oh, well, up to this time we were going along fine, we had telephone bell wires and there was a telephone bell wire strung between the Goals Problem Mass and the E-Meter and everything was fine. It was going along and the trickle of electricity came along, and all of a sudden we strung a hemp hawser.”

E-Meter won’t read. See, you’ve just mucked the whole thing up one way or the other. You put him out of communication. You’ve startled him. You’ve upset him in some way. He can’t get in communication with it because this thing restimulates and now he is only “it.” So you’ve put him on the wire. You’ve put him on . . into a position now where he just does nothing but “it” or what “it” says.

And, of course, “it” won’t read itself. The only thing that can read “it” is the E-Meter with the assistance of the pc and you. And you’re trying to study a piece of coal out there, a mountain-size piece of coal at about a half a mile away . . is what you’re really trying to do. It’s remarkable, remarkable that you can do it. It’s absolutely phenomenal. I never saw such a thing. It’s remarkable that there’s any solution to it.

And you’ll think so when you first start running the pc into it. And that will be when you have all five elements nicely found, all buttoned up and you’re all set with your first Prehav level and you say, “Here we go, we are now going to run Interest on a waterbuck. How would you interest a waterbuck? How would a waterbuck interest you?”

The opposition terminal is a lion. “How would a waterbuck interest a lion? How would a lion interest a waterbuck? How would a waterbuck interest . . .” (Oh . . what’s the matter with this E-Meter?) “How would a waterbuck interest himself?” (What the hell is the matter with this E-Meter?) “Haha. How would a wa- . Did you answer the last question? All right. That’s fine. All right. How would you interest a waterbuck? How would a waterbuck interest you?” Coo!

The thing is up there at 5.26 and the needle is getting paralyzed and whenever you say “waterbuck,” you get a flicker-flick. And you say happily, because you remember your 36 Havingness Processes and your old Confront Process, and you remember blowdowns and you know that meters can do this sort of thing. Oh, I assure you that this is not going to happen very fast, that sort of thing. It’s not going to happen.

A meter would blow down because you were running a chunk off something. Why, you're not going to run any chunk off a mountain. You're just going to run a mountain off a mountain. That's it. You just run the pc into this thing with a Mack truck. Crash. There's nothing going off of it. It's going to up to whatever it goes up to or down to whatever it goes down to, and it's going to stick and that's all.

Now, if you overran this by 30 commands, now maybe you've probably got trouble. You might have a little difficulty reassessing

If you overran it a session, oh well, just give the pc a knife, tell him to go cut his throat. It's much less painful. Much kinder. Because you're going to have a hell of a time reassessing. When that thing goes up and sticks, be sure it's stuck and get whether or not it's stuck by watching, in this particular run, the needle.

And you see the needle has frozen up here. It's just stuck up an inch from the set on the meter and it just keeps sitting there. There it is. It's in that same position. It's in the same position. It's in the same position. It's in the same position. It's in the same position. It's in the same position. It's in the same position. It's just about that many commands, you see, so I'd better start saying, "Well, just a couple of commands and we will end this process if that's all right with you. Humm-humm-humm-humm-hummm. All right. That's fine. Good." And we reassess.

And you'll be confounded when you go across the level you reassessed, you would swear that it wouldn't possibly have flattened in fifteen commands or something like this. Next time you go across the level, you'll say it'll sure fall again. It doesn't. It's just as quiet, just as nice. It's all rubbed. Because that was all the interest there was in it. You got the lot. It won't kick again.

Now, your next level . . Withdrawal or something . . and you run that and that might last a half an hour, it might last fifteen minutes, it might last two commands. But you run it to a stuck needle. Stuck tone arm and then stick the needle. Stick them both. You're perfectly safe. You can still reassess. Overrun it two hours, cut your throat . . be much kinder.

All right. Now, what upsets all this? Now, I think you could run all the Prehav levels there are and find them over into the Secondary Scale and run all these things and so forth and you'd eventually run it down to a free needle. This is a probability and perfectly all right and there's no reason why it wouldn't work.

But the thing you've got to watch is if the number of levels alive increase. You enter the thing with ten levels alive; there's ten levels of the Prehav Scale that you've got a knock on. And the next time you assess, you've got twenty-five levels alive and the next time you assess, you have fifty-two levels alive.

Ah, well, you shouldn't have reassessed that last time at all. You should have quit some time earlier. You should have done something, but check something out because you've got the wrong terminal. There's something wrong with your 3D assessment. You get increasing numbers of levels alive in the Prehav Scale.

All right. So that's pretty vicious. The probability is if you know how to read an E-Meter that you will never do a wrong assessment, if you know how to read an E-Meter and if you don't permit the pc to twiddle the fingers and do other things to sell you on reads and all that kind of thing. If you really know E-Metering, you'll never get a wrong assessment.

Now, as you look over the pc, follow this rule; that increasing levels alive on original assessments, you know what I'm talking about. You read down the seventy, eighty whatever it is, Prehav Scale and you've found that they were ten of them alive and then the next time you assessed, they were twenty alive. "Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, something is wrong here."

Now, if the rudiments are in and if the pc really ran it, and everything is all right and you've done a fairly good auditing job, the only thing left is that the 3D is somehow wrong.

But if you run into this situation, don't worry too much: there were twenty levels alive and then there are ten levels alive and then there were fifteen levels alive and then there were eight levels alive. In other words, don't worry about that. You'll get a fluctuating number.

But it's quite common on somebody who has been misaudited on wrong terminals to find every level . . pardon me, not every level alive, but maybe forty, fifty, sixty levels alive. And there has been a case on record of every level alive. Boy, that was really wrong So you want to watch that and that is your checkpoint. That is the point you check. That is your best checkpoint.

Now, this other thing will occur. As you run this, later and later on, in you run . . it runs on this terminal and with this package of commands. Later on as you run, you're going to get more and more tightness and a greater, faster restoration of flexibility, till it gets like this at about seven, eight levels deep on the run of the terminal.

It looks something like this: Pc is going along dandily. Everything is dandy. Everything is fine and the thing is going high and sticking. It'll keep going high. It'll even get higher. This condition even worsens, you understand, five, six levels deep. Actually it may go higher. It may have only been going to 4.0 but has now gotten into the habit of going to 4.5, and it's now getting up to 4.75 before it sticks, you see. It gets worse before it sticks every time. Feels more frozen too, and it feels more stuck up to the pc.

The pc doesn't like this. The pc doesn't know what this is all about. Pcs don't like this very much, you know. It's fast assessment and fast runs and then the new level and the pc doesn't quite know what they are doing on the new level. And they're just setting down for the long haul and then there all of a sudden, things are getting tighter and tighter and tighter, and . . and this is harder and harder to run and all of a sudden they go off and they . . you're off of it again and reassessing again. And they didn't even get a chance to find out what it was. And you'll find a pc will get rather confused on this, but that's perfectly all right. That's not half as confused as he has been.

Anyway, you'll find that as the pc looks at the wall or moves his elbow or bobs his head, the E-Meter changes. Well, let's say eight levels deep, the pc's attention is momentarily deflected by a buzzing at the window. And the whole thing blows down to 3.0, apparently a blowdown and it looks like a blowdown, but it is not a blowdown. The pc went out of session. In session the pc reads 5.0. Out of session the pc reads 3.0. Bang! Bang!

You just ask the pc if they wouldn't like to put down the cans a moment and stand up and stretch. Yeah. They stand up and stretch, sit down, pick up the cans again . . oh, they are way out.

They're nowhere near the Goals Problem Mass. They've gone suuudwen. And every time the thing blows down, you'll find the needle's a bit looser. It's a bit tighter or a bit looser. It's tighter higher and looser down and it finally starts to look kind of floaty.

Now, if we just went ahead and did nothing else but that, we would probably win. But it's a rather arduous activity and it's left in as a main . . mainly as a preventer and to keep the pc from going off the deep end while he's got all the raw meat at the beginning run. It's an easy run and it actually softens up the case and it makes things easier and gives you a time to check the terminal and make sure that it all ran all right and so forth and it's actually advancing the pc toward clearing.

But there are faster things to do to actually obtain a free, floating needle, which is what you're very close to on this first run. You'll . . you'll swear to Pete that you must be looking at a. . . Occasionally, you'll see one come in and go out again running some of these things.

Now, there are several things you can do. I'm not going to delineate these things; it's toward the end of the lecture and none of you are up that far anyhow. But remember now, to watch after your assessment . . on your first assessment run on the pc's terminal . . to watch it very carefully that you don't run that tone arm up and stick it and keep it stuck for an hour or two. This is just cruel and it is stupid and the case is getting nowhere and of course, violates a moving tone arm. If the case is getting anyplace, the tone arm is moving and believe me, that tone arm isn't going to be moving on the early runs. It goes up and it sticks.

Let it go up as high as it'll go up. Don't check it from going up. Let it go as high as it goes. Fine, so it went to 6.5. Who cares? If that's where it's going to stick, if that's the Goals Problem Mass density, all right. So it's 6.5. It just makes it a little tough on you because the E-Meter won't read 7.0.

But you know, a constant little rising drift of the needle and so forth, that's not a stuck meter. It's when that rising stops and when everything stops and when everything has been stopped and it isn't going anyplace at all. You get off of that, man. Just get off of it as soon as you're sure.

Now, you've got lots of latitude. You could probably sit there and run it for another half an hour without doing anybody any damage. You'd still reassess and so forth.

The pc would squawk. They'd say things are getting a little bit tight and they couldn't think of answers and they feel uncomfortable and they were beginning to feel a little bit nervous and what were you doing and the rudiments tend to start to go out, and things like that.

But you could run it over a half an hour without getting into severe trouble. I'm asking for you to overrun it maybe 10 or 15 minutes at the absolute outside. It's much more comfortable on the pc. But run it to a stuck needle . . stuck arm, stuck needle.

First the arm will stick and then you'll watch the needle stick too. It won't happen suddenly. It'll go . . everything will drift to a slow halt.

Now, you're going to make this mistake. You're going to say, "Well, look, if I say the level to them . . Interest, Interest, Interest . . well, I still get a bang on this thing. The level is still registering on the meter, so therefore it couldn't be stuck." Well, that's all you are going to get off of it, is the level ticking You can get a tick off the level, and that is the last motion in it.

And when you reassess the level, you won't find that tick is in the level anymore. If anything, you're ticking off your own auditing commands, which is the probability. But it'll actually freeze up and will still tick. You know, I mean you say, "Interest." And when you first assessed Interest, you got a half a division of theta bop, see, when you assessed it. So you say, "Interest" to the person and you get a half a division theta bop. You say, "Interest," you get half a division theta bop. You say, "Interest." It has to be a very meaningful interest for you to get a twitch.

But you can still say that to the person after the arm is stuck on running the level Interest. And then come off of it and reassess, and you will find Interest is . . won't ever get another read on Interest. That's it, it's gone. See what I mean?

So don't . . I'm just telling you, you can make a little mistake. You can say to yourself: "Well, no . . . When I say 'interest' I can see that thing going bic, you know. I can see it going . . . So therefore, therefore, Interest as a level is still alive." No, it's not.

Interest as a level is as dead as the tone arm is motionless, as the needle is going nowhere on the whole command.

You'll see these things really slow down. It's just like sinking a pc into the middle asphalt. Thud. He just walks down to a complete stop. And of course, you've run him into the opposing vectors and that sort of thing Very interesting, because you'd swear you were killing the pc and you'd think it was a poor show. And you'd think there was no way out of it.

Well, there are ways out of it. The Prehav Scale itself is a way out of it, well audited. There's one more thin strand of rope that goes the rest of the way across the canyon, which is a pat series of auditing commands that will walk out of it.

Unfortunately, there is just one series that walks out of it very easily and very rapidly. Others walk out of it in other ways. And there are many other things you can do. Don't think we've run out of that. But there is at this moment only one auditing process.

We're at this frail point of Scientology. As far as broad, general, thorough everybody clearing is concerned, we have one Routine . . 3D . . that is that will lead them actually directly toward Clear, not straighten up their lives or that sort of thing. We got Class II techniques that do that. But I'm talking about clearing techniques. We just really have one.

Don't think you still have 3. I wouldn't let you run it. I mean Routine 3. I wouldn't let you run it anymore. It would be senseless. It's too hit or miss.

And we've got one process that finishes up the Prehav Scale. We got one Prehav Scale and after that we've got just one process that apparently does it all. Boy, that's no riches, is it? And if you bitch these things up on a pc, I'm going to give an auditor a process to run on you that'll run you straight into it and that nothing can undo.

Because it's something on the order . . I will warn you, on some pcs it's something on the . . it's scary. It's something on the order of sending a guy to swim the Hellespont with one piece of string to pull him back with, you know. It's a little bit scary.

So do a good job on it, huh?

And that's why you must never, never, never, never, never, never let anybody run 3D that isn't a Class II Auditor of superlative skill and who is able to do 3D assessments. You understand? Don't let anybody monkey with it or you'll have more pcs to fish out of the drink. And at this stage at least nothing to fish them out with as far as I'm concerned, because I know nothing now but this tightrope. There's just one rope, one Prehav Scale, one Prehav level line and one process which salvages it all. That's all we've got. Those are all the riches you've got. You're rich as long as you're skillful, but then who isn't.

Thank you very much.