

SAINT HILL SERVICE FACSIMILE HANDLING

A lecture given on
18 September 1963

Thank you.

Well, now, this is the . . . ?

Audience: 18th.

The 18th of . . . ?

Audience: September.

September. What planet?

Audience: Earth. A.D. 13.

A.D. 13. And solar system.

Now, today I'm going to talk to you about the service facsimile and the state of the PC and a Saint Hiller method of moving in with a service facsimile and straightening up a case.

Now, you have to know where the stops are on the organ before you can play an organ. This helps a great deal. You have to know where the keyboard is, and with the new electronic organs you have to know where the switch is and a few things of that particular character.

So just sailing in on a case with great nonchalance, you see, and not turning on the switch of the E-Meter, and not finding out anything about the case's PT, and having no safeguards of any kind whatsoever—and not knowing what you're doing anyway—might be rather adventurous, might be rather adventurous. In fact, I think every psychiatrist that has been along this ground is very adventurous. Never was so much done by those who knew so little.

This situation, however, stems from lack of technology and lack of know-how. Now, this know-how situation with regard to the mind is very, very hard to arrive at. There are so many suppositions that . . . just walking through a forest of favorite beliefs. And when you realize that every case and every practitioner in the field of the mind would be concentrated on one aspect of existence and then dedicated to not observing existence except through that one evaluation of existence, you see at once the tremendous limitations imposed upon the discovery of anything about the mind, and then, secondarily, getting any application of any truth known. Do you see that this, then, would be a self-defeating proposition?

Not only are we given a vast panorama of data, any one of which can be a favorite aberration (not a truth but an aberration, don't you see?) in this vast forest, but then we ask people who themselves are concentrated upon favorite data, you see substituting for themselves to handle this situation—and you get a difficulty; you get randomness right there.

Now, let's compound the randomness and realize that knowledge about the mind means freedom for life and beings in this universe. Once you recognize that as a principle, you will see that anyone who is dedicated to total enslavement or the dwindling spiral or caving anyone in and caving everyone in, and so forth, are immediately not in favor of total knowledge of the human mind, but quite on the contrary are in favor of great ignorance.

And there's two ways of accomplishing that ignorance. One is simply a denial of information, which is practiced but sometimes cannot be fully enforced. For instance, the Catholic church for many, many centuries made a great thing out of "ignorance is wisdom," you see?

Everybody had to be good and stupid and so forth, and whether you're Catholic or not you'd have to admit that that was the modus operandi of the existing church over a period of about, oh, I think it must have been eight hundred years or something like this: it's almost their total devotion was to ignorance.

Well, it doesn't go just that far. That sooner or later gets interrupted. But there's something that can be substituted for total ignorance, and that is false data. And false data is probably a much more effective means of denying freedom.

One of the ways of going about false data, for instance: The fellow wants to get out of the woods and there are two trails. And one trail lies much deeper into the woods and the other trail goes out on to the plain. And all you have to do is put up a sign at the crossroads and point to that trail which goes deeper into the woods and say, "This way lies freedom," you see, and you've promptly trapped a lot of people.

And that is such an easy action that when it is added to the fact that everybody is sort of mired down in their favorite fixated data, this can become quite a vicious morass. The trick is, then, to find the exact mechanics, the exact, precise mechanics which apply to all minds.

Now, the moment you have found the exact, precise mechanics which apply to all minds, you can then get a broad agreement on the situation, because they override the minor data on which the people are fixated. In other words, they also would have this broader perimeter of data and they'd recognize the truth in the broader perimeter of data.

But the moment that you move even a sixteenth of a millimeter sideways off of what is generally applicable to all minds, you're again into the particularities and opinions. So therefore, if you had a broad sphere of knowledge which was true, and these were all high generalities and everybody would agree with them, frankly it'd be very easy to bankrupt and upset that whole operation by taking it, and by false relay—you see, bad instruction and bad relay of this material, and dropping out a datum here and a vital datum there, and substituting something or other—you eventually could then again effect a sort of a slavery out of that information.

In other words, even if you arrive at the technology, you still have the task of safeguarding the technology because, once more, it can easily turn and become a false technology.

These are the various ramifications that Scientology has had to deal with over a period of many years. And the solution to the difficulty is results, because once the technology is applicable so that results occur by reason of its application, then, of course, you don't get any arguments with these. You don't get the intrusion of a great deal of criss crosses.

So the whole contest has been not for the achievement of certain truths—we have had many of these for years—but a workability so that we attain an application of those truths toward a rapid release of attention from favorite and fixated data. And in that wise, then, the truth is carried out by a demonstration that if it is used a greater freedom is attained.

And we have to look at how long is the attention span of a preclear. Well, in actual fact, as far as Scientologists are concerned, their attention span, their willingness to go along and try in this direction, is terrific. But the casualties which occur along the lines occur because the body of knowledge has not arrived in an individual in the release of his attention from his favorite data. Do you see that?

This fellow is sure that all horses sleep in beds. Now, it isn't only that he has this as a fixed datum; he also has this as a total datum. And any data that does not contribute to horses sleeping in beds he will discard. You see, it's not just that he's got this one idea. He's got this idea which then bends all ideas toward this idea. And the truth of any existing situation is whether or not it fits this idee fixe. His idea of separating truth from falsehood is whether or not it fits his idee fixe. Now, if the thing is false, it doesn't fit his idee fixe and therefore

should be thrown away. And if it is true, it does fit his idee fixe and therefore should be retained. All of which is rather interesting, because if his idee fixe were “horses sleeping in beds,” he would only listen to mental technology that affected horses or beds.

Therefore—therefore, the early discovery, and the long dormancy, arising in a greater use and application of the service facsimile means a great deal to Scientology. Means a very great deal to Scientology because you’re now dealing with the one reason you can’t get across a general truth to a preclear. You’re not trying to teach this preclear anything but you’re trying to show this preclear that by reason of what you are doing you get a release of attention so that the world looks brighter, and he can look further and he feels better and more powerful.

Now, if you do not attain this in a session with any given PC over—sometimes it can be a very long period of time—but if you do not eventually attain this, you will eventually lose your PC. Sometimes it lasts only an hour and sometimes it would last for several years.

Now, the degree that the PC will sit there patiently has direct ratio to how fixed his idea is. Now, the PC who will sit there for years waiting for a greater truth does not have his attention so involved with an idee fixe, you see, that he cannot absorb the greater application of the material which he is presented with to process. And he will get perimeter benefits even though his idee fixe is not touched. He gets these perimeter benefits solely and totally because he is not that fixed! Do you see? He’s just not that fixed.

Now we take this bloke who says that horses sleep in beds, and that is the total modus operandi of life. We have to look at the totality which this can become. This is the eighth, seventh, sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, first dynamic, see? All sex is answered by the fact that horses sleep in bed. The way to run a family is to have horses sleep in beds, you see? God is actually a horse sleeping in a bed, see? This has really got to be a fixed datum.

Now, to the degree the datum is fixed, he is not able to explore the perimeter of his ideas and therefore cannot see a greater truth. In other words, he’s more entrapped and more imprisoned than the next one. Now, that is what is known as very bad mental condition: It’s how fixed this one idea is.

Now, when you’re dealing with neurosis, you have somebody who has an idee fixe which only occasionally arises to wreck his life, and he can see a little more beyond that. But when you have psychosis, you have only the idee fixe only. Just as I just told you: God is a horse sleeping in bed, see. You’ll find the institutions are full of these blokes.

Now, that’s it. Now, that scares you when you start thinking about the fact that you, of course, have a service facsimile that is an idee fixe and so forth.

All right. It’s degree, then. It’s degree. Your attention isn’t so pinned down by that that you can’t examine a greater truth, or you wouldn’t be sitting here this very minute, so immediately you’re lifted out of the ranks of the insane and the neurotic. See? Just by definition. That proves itself quite self-evident.

Now, you can see some wider idea. But let’s take Mamie Glutz or some body, the cashier at the local service station, and we try to explain to her— we try to explain to her—that beings are beings and that each one of them has a mind. Let’s just go that far, see?

Now, if she’s got a very furious idee fixe of one kind or another, such as “all men are alike,” see, this doesn’t fit. So therefore, you become false. To her, you are false, do you see? Then any datum which you utter on the broad perimeter of life, if it doesn’t add up to “all men are alike,” is a false datum. You could have an elephant stand in the middle of the room, and say “That’s an elephant.” Well, it’s not a man, so therefore it’s a false datum, don’t you see? So that you’re indicating that an elephant is standing in the middle of the road—and there is an elephant there—you are indicating a false datum to her. And therefore you are saying something foolish.

She knows this. How does she know this? Well, she knows this because, naturally, “all men are alike.”

One fine day you happen to tell her, “A lot of men are aberrated. In fact, most all men have aberrations of one kind or another.” You’re in there cooking; you’re now true. This one accidental datum goes by and latches on to this service facsimile, see? Just one. Now you spake truth. And perhaps from there on, everything you utter, she will say, “That is true.” But once more, it’s without evaluation or inspection.

Now, get the degree, then, the degree of fixation upon an all-resolving datum and then you have the degree of enslavement of the individual. These things actually are not degrees of knowledge or ignorance but simply degrees of freedom or slavery. It is secondary—entirely secondary—that truth is truth and falsehood is falsehood. It’s whether or not it leads to freedom or slavery that establishes your final amount of truth, because fixation is only upon falsehood. You can never get fixated on truth. That’s quite a fascinating thing.

Truth is an all-freeing mechanism. If it is not all-freeing, then the truth to some degree must be limited—either limited in its conception or limited in its reception limited in its application. So that you can say that anything you were worried about must have a falsehood connected with it. There is always a lie connected with anything that you are having a hard time with.

You go out and you can’t start your car. And you fool around with it and fool around with it and fool around with it, trying to start the car. And you finally realize that it must be the carburetor. So you have the carburetor fixed. And you still can’t start your car. Obviously you conceived a falsehood about the car. It couldn’t have been the carburetor because after you fixed the carburetor the car still didn’t run. This is easily demonstrated in the field of mechanics you see, because things run or don’t run. So there was a connection with your analysis of what is wrong with the car.

Now you say, “Well, it’s probably the spark,” and you fix the spark in some way and the car runs. Therefore, that must have been the truth.

Well, we can’t observe, to that degree, people running or not running. Their motors don’t purr or stop, and they appear to be all right when they’re not and they appear to be not all right when they are. And very often an auditor has been very embarrassed at the end of session to sort of start apologizing for what a terrible session it’s been and get the whole load in his face on the subject of taking away the PC’s gains: “Why, I had a fine session! It’s a marvelous session! Found out a lot of things! Had a terrific time!” you see, and so forth. Far as the auditor’s observation was concerned, the PC was sitting there quite glumly and hadn’t had much of a session.

All right, another way: An auditor is looking at the PC, and the PC is smiling sweetly and so forth, and so forth. And actually the PC is practically spun in by the session, don’t you see? Now, you can make that observation of the PC a modus—well, a cause here.

Let’s look at how far we have come in this direction. You are actually now in a position to determine, without the faintest difficulty, whether it was a good session or a bad session for the PC without asking the PC. Now, that’s rather terrific. This doesn’t look like much, don’t you see? But that’s pretty terrific.

If the PC got an acceptable amount of tone arm action in the session, the PC by session end might have even been roughed up by something but still would have had a gain and will be fine the next day. But the PC who did not get tone arm action in the session will not feel good at session end, no matter what they say, and the next day will probably feel terrible. One session, no TA action: PC bad off.

Now, that doesn't look like much. That doesn't look like much That looks like a datum which you now know and which you're living by and auditing by and it just doesn't look like much. Actually, there was more wisdom in that discovery than there has been in the former fifty thousand years of thinking man, because it immediately and directly took out of the realm of inspection, worsening or improvement as a result of treatment. There's no opinion about it now. We don't have to depend on the auditor's opinion or the PC's opinion. There's no dependency on that at all. Did you get tone arm action of an adequate amount? All right, then that PC is going to feel good at the end of session and the PC is going to feel better the next day. You didn't get an adequate amount of tone arm action: The PC is not going to feel good at the end of session and not going to feel better the next day, no matter what the PC says.

Now, once in a blue moon you can turn off a somatic and the PC feels nice about the somatic going off, without getting a great deal of tone arm action— without getting a great deal of tone arm action. But you watch that PC during the next forty-eight hours and exactly the same result will occur. I mean, we haven't stepped sideways from the basic data involved in it at all.

Now, that's interesting. That's interesting. Therefore, just on that little grounds alone, we must know something about the mind and be able to do something about the mind which is in excess of what has been done about the mind. Look at the tininess of what I am giving you here, you see? That's hardly anything, you see? But that truth will hold up—that truth will hold up. You say, "Well, it's a mechanical truth, it's an application truth, it's this kind of a truth." But nevertheless it'll hold up.

As you go along and audit, you will find out that that truth holds up. In fact, you're finding it out right now. You've sat there over a stuck tone arm for two and a half hours, you've looked at the end of session and the PC has been going groan and creak, and it hasn't been going too well. And if you cared to look at the PC a few hours later, you'd find the PC sort of caving in, in various spots. PC [will] be natterly to you in the next session and that sort of thing. By the time you've gone three sessions without any tone arm action, you will start wishing you had never started auditing this PC in the first place, because the reactions are going to be rather extreme. In other words, this will follow out a general observation.

So therefore, we must be dealing, where we're dealing with the PC, in certain principles of action. Those principles of action are also very elementary. They fall back immediately upon the idee fixe: the stable datum and the confusion. And it must mean that all confusion's are there, and therefore all masses are there? because they are held in abeyance so far as observation is concerned, and will never as-is, by a stable datum. A stable datum, then, prevents observation of the environment or these masses and therefore accumulates masses. A stable datum is a dam erected across the river, and with that stable datum firmly in place no water is going to flow.

Now, what is wrong with the mind? Well, it must be that a stable datum was adopted in lieu of inspection. A person ceased to inspect. For some reason or other he fell back from inspecting, fell back from living, fell back from being anywhere and just let everything go to pieces. Oh, he says, "Well, I'll put this stable datum there and the devil with it all. To hell with it. I'm . . ." He either said, "I'm incompetent" or "I'm bored with it" or "I want to be elsewhere," or something of the sort. He said something. But he still put a datum there to substitute for his own observation and his own coping with life and the situation at large.

And at that moment he started to get an accumulation of confusion. Because you can write "I eat pie" on a piece of paper and put it in the middle of a bake shop and it won't do a thing: It won't bake any pies, it won't buy any pies, it won't sell any pies, it won't do a thing. You can put "bake shop" over the door so that people will know that's where the bake shop is, and start handing out pies and selling pies and doing things like that, and you have handled a confusion just to that degree. But the moment you put "bake shop" in the middle of the place and take the baker out, you haven't got a bake shop. See, it's pretty obvious.

Well, when the thetan did a bunk and left an idea where he was, after that no confusion gets as-ised, but on the contrary, rather develops at a high rate of speed. You get more and more confusion's and less and less as-ising. And eventually this develops what we call mass—mental mass.

Once you shake up that stable datum—whether you find the exact stable datum or not—once you shake it up by finding a cousin datum to it or finding something in its perimeter, you have taken some bricks out of the dam that is lying across the river, and water is going to start to flow down that river. And as it flows it tends to wipe away more and more stable data. And true, as in any hydraulic works, you're going to get more flow and more widening of the hole the flow is going through, the more flow there is. You've got to start the flow flowing.

Now, how does the stable datum become so fixed? It becomes fixed by the very thing it's supposed to confront. It gets fixed by the confusion it's supposed to handle and doesn't. And the more it is in place to hold back the confusion, the more confusion batters at it, so the more accumulation of confusion you get around the vicinity of this stable datum.

It's something like twirling a bowl of taffy or something like that—twirling a fork in it. You're just going to get more and more taffy on the fork, don't you see? Because it is there. If it weren't there, you weren't going to get any.

Now, it might be there to remedy the confusion: actually it accumulates confusion's. And you get more and more accumulation of confusion and therefore more and more mass, and more and more this; and more and more that, and more and more eradication, and less and less ability to inspect and communicate on the part of the individual. And finally the whole house gets full of these things. And the guy has got no place to move anymore and he sore of sits there and he himself is one of these things. And you can't find the PC because he's just another stable datum. He knows, see, and so on.

And man: man has gone the route. Man talks about the brain when he talks about the mind. And if you want a commentary—if you want a commentary on a state of mental technology—just look for the degree that the thinkingness or beingness of the man is considered to be mass. And the more a being is considered to be mass, the lower the technology extant will be found to be. Why? They're just dramatizing the stable datum and the confusion.

So you look for modern science. Modern science says, “Man's an animal —ha-ha.” See? “Man is an animal. And it's—he's a brain, and electronic impulses go this way and that way and that causes thought.”

What have you got here? What have you got here? You've got a brain substituted for the being. And if all mental technology believes that, what kind of condition must those practitioners be in? They're in the condition which you see them in today. That's pretty grim. They're hard people to have anything to do with.

Now, you wonder why they are hard to train. And they are hard to train. And one of these fine days you'll be training them. Just remember that their whole orientation has already added up to a tremendous confusion which has used a brain as a stable datum.

So you'd run a process like “Tell me all about the brain.” “What decisions have you made about the brain?” And you're going to get tone arm action. And all the charge of the former confusion's which have been stopped by false data is going to flow by on your E Meter tone arm. And the next thing you know, they have enough inspection ability to learn. And that's why they're hard to teach. That's all. Because all the knowledge you're handing them, they do this with it: You say, “Now, there is the idea of flows. And when a flow flows too long in one direction it tends to get stuck.”

And this is the way they receive this datum: “Uh . . . let’s see, a flow flows too long. . . brain. They’re talking about blood. Uh . . . this is a discussion, then, of the causes of coronary thrombosis.” So they write down “Coronary thrombosis, diagnosis of.” Get the idea?

What’s holding this . . . ? Well, how come? How come there’s no inspection? Well, because they’re even depending on their own brains to do their inspection for them. You imagine a thetan getting so lazy that the brain is going to inspect everything for him.

Well now, this, then, is actually just putting your attention on the limitations of beings to the recognition of truth or falsehood. And that recognition is limited in direct ratio to the amount of fixation upon a stable datum. And that’s the degree of limitation. Very important principle.

How then can an individual who is totally boundaried and bound in and totally fixated—ant he himself is a stable datum by this time; he’s no longer a living being—how can he be expected to get anywhere? What can you do for him?

Well, you think, well, let’s see, there’s two approaches here. You could take a datum of enormous magnitude and you could hold a gun on him and you say, ‘If you don’t believe this new stable datum, we will shoot you.’ I’m not now talking about an unused method, see? You say, “Heil Hitler, or you’ll at once be talking to the Schutzstaffel” see? That’s a substitution of a datum for understanding. He’ll be talking to the Schutzstaffel, promptly.

Patriotism rises on every hand. See, everybody says “Heil Hitler” all the time, and eventually the nation goes down in defeat. Why does it become defeated? Well, there’s nobody there stopping any confusion or handling anything at all except a stable datum known as “Heil Hitler.”

Mussolini’s empire went the route. One of his boys was always expected to call Rome if he had to make a decision. Now, when the Allies first went into Sicily they had to appoint some of these blokes back into civil positions. First they appointed a whole new batch and found out they’d appointed the Mafia into total control of everything. And they had to reverse this and get some of the old Fascist officials. And they said th ! only thing wrong with them was they couldn’t think for themselves. They always had to call Rome to know what to do with a piece of paper or something of the sort, and the lines were real busy. But that empire too went down to defeat.

So this method of holding the pistol or the sword or the fist and saying “accept this stable datum or else,” and so forth, has a level of workability. And it is used, but normally ends up in greater slavery and certainly less effectiveness. It can be counted on to wind up with less effectiveness—less IQ.

Now, we made a study in Johannesburg, inadvertently, but made a study down there of a bunch of papers that came through from school children. And we had one school that was tested from one end to the other down there in the test department. It was quite interesting to see the deterioration of the IQ of the child. I think the highest IQ that we measured in Johannesburg was a seven-year-old boy, if I remember rightly. I may have this data wrong. But he had an IQ of about 200. And that was about the highest IQ we had around there.

So, but studying the school at large as they had progressed from class to class to class to class, you saw a deterioration of their IQ. Well, that was an interesting commentary on the school, because the school was never asked to inspect anything, never asked to understand anything. But they had to accept this as a datum, never inspect it in any way, shape or form, and let it stand as a substitute for themselves. Of course, you got a deterioration of IQ. Right?

Now, there’d be a whole new level of education if you said to somebody, “Look this over very, very carefully and decide what is true about it and what is false about it and what is workable and what is unworkable.” That’s a whole new zone and area of education, and a very interesting zone and area of education. But you see at once what limits it; With

everybody fixated on his own special idea by which he's going to tell rightness from wrongness, that, as a totality, can't exist. But it's another idea, you see?

Now, this would be another method of going about this: And that would be to free up people's ideas so their perimeter of inspection increased, and having increased, let them inspect the data which lies before them. Therefore, you have a sort of a cross of these two schools of thought. You lead them up with a certain disciplined action that finally shows them their *idee fixe*—inadvertently, not even intentionally, but just leads them right straight to that. That then, knocked out of the way, shows them a greater perimeter of understanding, and you could lead them forward continuously to higher and higher levels of understanding and to total freedom. Because remember that the individual is trapped to the degree that his ideas are fixed.

You're actually leading any person who is not Clear, then, out of a morass of entrapment, not out of a morass of ignorance. And he's trapped to the degree that his ideas are fixed. Therefore, it is of the greatest importance to you to find, first and fastest, the idea on which he is the fixedest. That's very important, then. And that would give you the speed of processing. That determines the speed that processing is done at. It's how fast can you find the *idee fixe* and free the individual for a broader perimeter of inspection.

Exteriorization, even the state of OT, depends upon bringing about greater states of freedom, not greater states of wisdom. This is an important differentiation, because the wisdom will take place anyway. But by concentrating on the wisdom you are all too prone to fall over into the idea of the implanted stable datum. But if you think of it in terms of freeing his attention, you then lead to freeing the being.

The only thing that can trap a thetan is his attention. That is all that can trap a being—stone walls do not, definitely.

You have a situation here where an individual is totally untrappable: completely and utterly untrappable by anyone except himself. What traps a being is his unwillingness to confront things which are not interesting to him, or to back out of situations in which he has lost interest, or to move off and go his way but still, somehow or another, be responsible for where he was and what combinations lead to this situation.

Well, we are studying, now, how does an individual fix his attention and then substitute for himself or for thinkingness or for something else, some inanimate postulate? Joe was here, you see? Here he is as a thetan, able to contest, confront and handle any of the confusion's in his direction, see? And actively doing so.

Now, he says, "I have an unconscious mind that does all that."

How has he trapped himself?

He says, "This is an unawareness area which is going to handle these confusion's."

Steen-trillion-squillion years afterwards, Sigmund Freud comes along and finds the unconscious mind. Well, actually, the unconscious mind would be that totality of stable data which are holding back that totality of confusion which the individual is no longer aware of but is still doing.

Well, so much for freedom and slavery. That's all it amounts to: it's freedom and slavery—of the individual's fixed attention and so forth.

Now, of course, the individual can go to extreme and extraordinary limits. They say, "Well, you are the auditor and I'm depending on you utterly as my auditor to free me. And therefore my idea is fixed on you, so therefore I ought to be able to go off and self-audit myself, and so forth, because it's very bad to have my attention fixed on you as an auditor" Well, that's

strictly ding, ding, ding, here comes the wagon. You're not part of his stable data. You're part of his environment. There's a slight difference. You are freeing his attention, not entrapping it. There's a difference.

Now, how does all that add up in our modern swing and quick look around on technology? I have just given you all the important data. I haven't given you the ramifications of this data or how it becomes fixed in this and how a thetan exactly does it. I haven't given you any of the mechanics of the situation. But I actually have given you the fundamental rationale which brings about aberration. And actually they're—you can name a lot of parts to all this, but you've got it right here in just what I've just got through telling you. There's actually no more in the essence of the broad theory to the subject than just what I have told you. There's really no more to it.

Now, the technology of how you free up somebody's attention; the exact method of how it is entrapped; the exact comparisons that trap it; the exact things he does to form these entrapments and that sort of thing: That's a broader field of technology. But it nevertheless has a total dependency on the data which I've just now given you.

And when you are looking for the PC's service facsimile, therefore you are looking for that thing in present time on which his ideas are most fixated—his attention is most fixated in present time. That is what you're looking for when you have a service facsimile. If you find any cousins, sisters, aunts of the service facsimile kicking around and knock those out—any other stable data that are around—you're going to get tone arm flow. There's going to be flow and it's going to express itself on that tone arm.

"Horses sleep in beds": you inadvertently hit on "bedside tables." Oh, you get lots of flow, because "bedside tables" is part of the bed, don't you see? And you get flow, flow, flow, flow, flow—"bedside tables," you see? You don't ever expect that it's connected with beds, much less suspect it's connected with horses.

But you've got your paws on "bedside tables." Therefore, you're finding something which is at least a first cousin to his service facsimile.

Service facsimile by definition is the last optterm or terminal that the individual has or is forming—has formed or is forming. It's the last pair of RIs in combination—it's that pair that makes it—last pair of RIs formed up at the top of the last GPM postulated. That's exactly what the service facsimile is. It isn't anything else. But you're going to find a lot of cousins sitting around in there. Of course, he's busy getting this one together, see? Who opposes horses sleeping in beds, you see? "A horse master," you see? So he's busy being a horse master, or something like this, and that's his beingness and stable datum for life, you see? And what he is opposing is horses sleeping in beds, but horses sleeping in beds he believes . . . You can get some kind of a ramification out of that. I'm not now trying to give you a neat picture of these last two items. That's beside the point, but just take it that they're there, see?

Now, sitting around in their vicinity you've got all kinds of things: you've got a horse master's hat, you see, so you've got a hat; you've got a whip; you've got boots; and you've got bed—or you've got posts, you see; or you've got sheets; or you see, you've got all of these little additional items, see? There are tremendous numbers of items scattered around here, completely aside, you see, from a horse master and a bed and a horse, see? There is much more stuff. You get your hands on any one of those little things and you're going to get some tone arm action.

Tone arm action actually depends on your getting your paws on one of those things. You can call any one of them, for just practical purposes, you can call them, "Well, I found a service fac," or something like that. I don't care whether you call it or not. That's not neat. That's not neat. You won't know whether it's a service fac or not until you've found the actual GPM and found its two top items. And then you'll know what the service fac really was. And your face is going to get somewhat red, see? It's "horses sleep in beds," you see, and it's

something about horses in beds, you see? And man, you had it all figured out that it was bedside tables and had to do with the second dynamic, you know? You had it taped. Didn't have anything to do with the second dynamic at all. It had to do with the fifth dynamic. Quite amusing. You'll nearly always find yourself that far off when you're just entering from the top with R3SC. So just expect to be. You'll be on the safe side.

The chances of your actually finding the service facsimile itself in a combination of two items is not merely rare—it's impossible. So get that well. It's impossible—can't be done. It requires the illumination of knowing they are part of that bank before they are recognizable to the PC. PC just won't recognize them, that's all. Even if you found them, the PC would reject them because they don't identify with the goal. You don't have the combination of the last goal (closest to PI, you see), and those two RIs and their relationship to that goal. And then, you've got to get those three things before you get a total "Hey! What do you know!" See? And then you get it, see? But before that, you could have actually had it on the list and it wouldn't have meant anything to the PC.

So you're not going to find the PC's service facsimile. Do you understand? But go ahead, try like mad, because it's on that route that you're going to find the last GPM.

Every one of these little goof ball things like "the bedside table," "a bedside lamp," "a chamber pot that sits under the bed"—any one of these things . . . You find these things, you know, and he adds them all up and that fits over there and they don't fit any such place, but that's all right. He adds them all up. And you get tone arm action, tone arm action. You list for the thing. And he won't get any real relationship of how this relates with that. But he'll get some action. It does mean something in his environment does have something to do with it.

By the way, tremendous subjects come into this. Somebody suddenly going to cognite that we're dealing with, also, Freudian fetishism. This is Freudian fetishism. Some narrow perimeter of this would be fetishes. You know, the guy is absolutely fixated on getting ahold of women's dancing pumps, you know? He has closets full of them, you see? All of this sort of thing. That's a Freudian fetish. They went through all sorts of wild things along this particular direction. But they're simply objects associated, on some distant perimeter, with the service facsimile. And, of course, a person seldom is that fixated on any object. It actually is not common to all cases. But you will find these things around and it's rather fun to look at them. You'll find grandfather's pipe, or something like that, you see? Oh, you get lots of action on the thing, you see? Terrific, you see? 'c had an ally, and he'll figure it all out and he's got it all taped, and that sort of thing. And he won't have anything to do with it. When you finally get the service facsimile, service facsimile maybe has something about pipes in it, you know, "steam pipes" or something, not anything about smoking pipes

But you got too close an identification, see? So all of these things get identified into the bundle because he is incapable of inspecting them very freely; they cross-associate and you can bleed charge.

Now, what has got the PC so restimulated that you can't get tone arm action? The two top RIs of the last GPM formed or being formed. That's what's got him so restimulated; that's what makes his present time so miserable. And that's what charges up his tone arm so it won't move. It even cross-influences into auditing restimulation, because his auditing is being monitored by these two top RIs.

So, when you get down to the—the final chips are in, you haven't got any choice but to find the PC's goal. Not the PC's backtrack goal "to be a giant," you see? That's a very nice goal, and we appreciate that he had that goal, but that happens to be trillions-seventy ago. You can't even write trillions-seventy on this wall. You couldn't. Just writing along with normalized figures, just writing and writing and writing, you couldn't write them on this wall. That's a lot of time. And that's not present time!

You can, however, go skipping; by goal-oppose, goal-oppose, goal-oppose, goal-oppose, you can bring it on up to PT, see? When you get it up to PT, why, you'll see it ticking as the PI goal. And it ticks "yes"—you know Ouija-boards your meter. "Is this the present-time GPM?" you see? "Is this the goal you've last formed? This the goal closest to present time?" Tick, you see? All right, and whatever the goal says, "Is this a right goal?" Tick. "This a wrong goal?" No read. "Is it a wrongly worded goal?" No read. "Right goal?" Tick. "Present time goal?" Tick.

Then you look it over yourself and find out whether or not you think so. Like, it could be the goal "to be big," you see, or something like this. And that's a present-time goal? Ha-ha-ha-ha. Look! Self-evident: The fellow's here on earth. That isn't his present-time goal—self-evident. And he probably would have made some part of it if he had, don't you see? It may look too high-toned a goal to you, in which case you do another goal-oppose on it. And the worst that will happen to you—the very worst that will happen to you—is that you just run into greater and greater quantities of tone arm action. You're doing a goal-oppose, but it is the present-time goal, so you're peeling off the lower goals off of it.

Well, you'll eventually see you'll just run into more and more tone arm action, so you just ask it on the meter, "Is this the present-time goal?" And you get a nice read, now, see? And there it is, and you list for its top oppterm, you know? "Who or what would be the latest item formed or the latest idea formed concerning this goal 'to catch catfish'?"—whatever it is. List it out, get a reasonable list, not 189 pages, listing the guy back and forth, up and through and back and forth through his GPM, and back and forth through his GPM, and back and forth through his GPM, eye sockets getting darker and darker and face getting blacker and blacker, and back and forth through his GPM . . . "Well, we actually haven't run all the tone arm action out of it yet, we've only got 189 pages of listing...."

No, I'm afraid that isn't quite the sensible way to go about it. You're listing to find the top oppterm. However you find the top oppterm is how you find the top oppterm, see? You want the top oppterm—you don't want a list. And when you do this reasonable length of list, you know, and you got a clean needle listing to clean needle is very excellent—and you got a clean needle, why, there you've got it. And you null it down and you see one of them goes click, of one kind or another, nice little slash or a surge or something. Let the PC cognite on it for a while, prepcheck it and you'll see the most gorgeous rocket read you ever saw, and you needn't have seen a second, momentary, even-for-an-instant rocket read the whole way. And that's a discovery.

Now, the way you've been finding goals is you get the goal and you lay it out and you prepcheck it, and if it doesn't rocket-read it isn't the goal, and so forth. And you have to prepcheck it until it rocket-reads, and this thing is falling off the pin, and so forth.

Hey, what if this goal is "to be God," trillions-hundred. And you're prepchecking some PC at trillions-hundred while his top RI is "auditing": What do you think is liable to happen? The RI, the service fac in which he is sitting and that he's frozen in right here in present time, is "auditing." And that's an oppterm. And the terminal is "a screamer" or "an ARC-breaky PC."

Found that on a list the other day, and the auditor tried to sell it to me as a terminal. It turned out to be an oppterm, fortunately.

But look-a-here: There he is up here in PT with all that restimulation, see, in his environment and everything else falling in on his head. Those RIs are all ready to pull in. You take him back to trillions-a-hundred to prepcheck a goal? You going to get there? You going to see an RR? You're going to see an ARC-breaky PC. Going to be a little bit too much strain, isn't it?

So what's this add up to? This adds up to the difficulties in finding PC's goals was getting PC's goals to rocket read. That was the difficulty in finding PC's goals, not getting the PC to volunteer what his goal was, because PCs are always giving you a big sell on what their goal is. See, that's easy. You say to somebody . . . so forth and so on. You can finally get

something to read in this direction, see? But to get it to rocket read, to get it all polished up and laid out and that sort of thing, that was our trouble.

Well, you can do this whole operation without any prepchecking and bring it off with only ticks up to the point where you have prepchecked the top oppterm. And your first rocket read is after you've prepchecked—after you've given the PC the top oppterm and prepchecked it—and then, and only then, do you see your first rocket read. And it'll be gorgeous. You don't even have his GPM rocket-reading; you don't even have the goal rocket-reading; you're not doing anything with it at all. That's the way to find a service fac. Slippery. Sneaky.

Now, I'll give you the exact way you go about this, because I've left you rather stonied and it is not quite complete. But I haven't told you all the steps either! Now, the first thing you do is to find what you fondly hope is, and which the PC implicitly believes is, his service facsimile, which gives you enough tone arm action to act as an anchor to windward. This is Saint Hill method of finding—it's not just finding somebody's service facsimile, but actually clearing the whole case to OT. Here's the way you go about it, see?

You just hunt and punch around enough till you know you've got your paws on something that will bring about excellent tone arm action. And then you don't use it. Well, what do you want it for? Well, just for this reason: If you run a session totally without tone arm action, your PC is going to be pretty miserable and he's not going to get any gain from auditing and his morale is going to go down, he's going to feel bad the next day, and you're going to get into a no-auditing situation with great rapidity, see? So we take this—this thing called a service fac; we hunt and punch around until we find something that can produce tone arm action, We know it can. All we've got to do is prepcheck it or run right-wrong on it or domination. The PC is trying to cognite on it, you know, and that sort of thing, and trying to run this thing desperately and get tone arm action and all that sort of thing. And you politely—you've found it, see? And for some reason or other you don't do anything with it. It's going to produce tone arm action, though.

Now, therefore, you can afford half of your next session, if not two thirds of it, to flounder around where the GPMs are growing, with no tone arm action at all. And if you haven't gotten any tone arm action in the first half or two thirds of the session, and you haven't really got anyplace or got your hands on anything and you made a few bum steers, you can still cheerily, cheerily, cheerily say to the PC, "All right, now we're going to run your service facsimile."

"Why the hell weren't you doing it earlier?"

"Well, that's right. That's all right. It's all right," and so on, see?

So, pocketa, pocketa, pocketa, pocketa, pocketa; get some TA action, TA action, TA action; the PC comes out of it feeling fine. He's got some auditing, right?

Next session he comes back in expecting to run "peanut boilers" or whatever it was; you start looking for GPMs, see? Half the session, two thirds of the session goes by and you still haven't produced adequate tone arm action, you still got a service facsimile to run, see? So he gets a session, doesn't he? Everything's fine his morale is staying up and everything is fine.

The next session—if you're going this long (you've just been a complete knuckle head up to this point, see?)—you do your other list, and you've ruled out a few things now, and what you've tried isn't so good, and so forth.

Now, this one, about a third of the way through the session, you've found the goal "to be wonderful." And it went tick! And you said to the PC, "Is that your actual goal or is that an implant GPM?" And your search-out found it to tick every time you said "Is that an actual goal of yours?"

Well, we're not going to get that thing to rocket-read, because that is way back down the track. But we're going to go "What goal would oppose 'to be wonderful'?" And we're going to complete a list and we're going to find a goal and we're going to use this goal we find—it just ticked (the goal we find); just nice, healthy tick left in on the list, see? And we're going to ask about this goal. "This goal: Is that an actual GPM?" Don't you see? Going to go through the same routine as though we'd just found it, see, originally. "Is that an actual GPM? Is that," you know, "your own GPM?" and so forth. And "Is it . . . ?" so forth. And "Is it a present-time goal?" And of course, naturally, it isn't, most of the time.

You got it all straight—don't prepcheck it or anything silly like that because we don't want it live, see? Now let's roll up our sleeves and do a new goal-oppose list, see, and it was "to be a schnook," see? So we say, "What goal would oppose 'to be a schnook'?" see? And we get "To be an evil being," or something like this, don't you see? That's pretty high-toned for present time. Do the same thing with it, sort it all out, don't you see? And we finally move him up. We don't care if we moved him through twenty of these things, see? We found this little tab out. There was one goal that he claimed was his goal, see, and we could get a tick every time we said "Is that your goal personally—not an implant goal?" He's always very interested in it.

You guys are very lucky. For instance, I can look right over here: Guy over there's got a goal "to understand," see? I can look over here; I know what goal you've got; just watching your records, you understand? You know, because absorbed attention whenever you hit those implant goals, you know, boy! That ran, you know, boy, that was a good one. Got a big send out of this implant goal. Hell, naturally you got a big send out of the implant goal. It was your own goal, except that was the implant lock on it.

See, so you're rich. So anyway, you just take that goal—take that goal and say, "Is that your actual goal?" Tick, see? And so on. And do a goal-oppose list and move that thing by goal-oppose list only, you see, up to PT. And you finally get something. "Is this your PT goal?" You're very suspicious of that because sometimes you can be three goals away from the PT GPM, and it will still read "It's your PT goal." We just haven't discovered that other.

There's reasons for this, too, and I can give you the clue of what happens. When you've got the PT goal and you do a goal-oppose list against it, you don't t land the guy up in the future with Buck Rogers, see?

So you just do your goal-oppose, your goal-oppose—a reasonable length of list, see? And you just list your needle clean, null the thing down—it ought to null easily—and you get your goal-oppose list item. And you've got a new goal; go through the same business with that. You could occasionally, you know, mess it up. You didn't get the right goal or you fell into an implant goal. But you'll sort all that out on a meter. So you just make sure that you got the PC's own goal and it's closer to PT than the goal you had last time, see?

All right. Now, when you finally get his PT goal you can still be suspicious of it and list "What goal would oppose it?" See? "To drown myself," see? That's a nice PT goal, see? "To drown myself." That's pretty real for PT. All right. (Now, I don't say that ~ be anybody's actual goal; that's why I'm paraphrasing it.) All right. So we list "What goal would oppose it?" and we can't make it. We can't do anything with this list because we keep developing more and more tone arm action.

We're not now developing less and less tone arm action, the way you do on a normal goal-oppose list, you see, if you're not up there. You're going to produce more and more tone arm action. This needle is going to get floppier and floppier and looser and looser. The PC isn't going to ARC break, mostly because you're listing toward what his ideas would be sometime in the future, don't you see? But you're actually unburdening this goal. And when you start running the PI goal, you just start running into more and more TA action, and more and more TA action, so you know better than to continue that list. When I'm saying "more and more TA action," I mean TA action—not .25 divisions every hour, or something like that. I'm talking about TA action, you know? You know, TA action. You know, it's action. You

know? You know, action! Good action! Hot. And you start running and you find the further you run the hotter it gets. Yeah, you know you must be listing a goal-oppose against the Pr goal, because there isn't anything there to list against, and all you can do is run out the Pr goal.

You can also sometimes produce a blowdown: When you've picked up the PC's goal, you list against it, produce more tone arm action, you sometimes can produce a tremendous amount of blowdown by saying "Are there several of your own goals on this list?" Ppssssewwww! See? You just picked up his goal out of thin air and started listing—it was the PT goal. Well, of course, you list backtrack goals off the thing. You won't find one of them. See, you'll just keep listing them. And you'll find out a lot of them will start reading little bits. And the TA action is the thing to keep your eye on, though. You just—by listing against the Pr goal, "What would oppose that goal?"—you just get more and more TA action, see? Becomes a fruitless task trying to find another goal.

Now you're real safe. The meter says that it's the Pr goal, and the list and everything says the PI goal. Everybody knows it's the Pr goal. All right. You want to list for the top oppterm. By this time, you no longer need this other service facsimile to windward, because you're producing so much TA action that you won't be able to record it anyway.

So the thing to do is to list for that top oppterm and get yourself a nice list for the top oppterm. Now, it isn't, probably, the top oppterm—the thing is truncated. So you really don't know and the PC doesn't know if he's started to oppose the goal yet or not. You can ask that on the meter and clarify it for the PC: "Have you started to oppose this goal yet? Or are you still on the side of trying to execute it?" One or the other will read, and you can tell the PC so he's got some kind of an idea of what to list for. But even that isn't totally reliable. But you could help a PC out to that degree.

You merely want the latest opposition terminal formed for this GPM or for this goal "to catch catfish" or "to drown myself" or whatever it is, see? And just have him list the thing.

All right, so we list this and you get one. You null it down. You got to list it to clean needle—that's the main trick. And you list it down, you get a nice, clean needle and you null it. Don't have two rocket-reading items on the list. All the listing directions apply here.

But I wouldn't worry too much about this or worry too much about whether it's the top oppterm, because—you know, I mean, don't beat the guy to death for fifteen sessions trying to find out if it's the top oppterm when it obviously is getting a hell of a lot of TA action—"Well, don't cognite yet. We don't know it's the top oppterm. Yes, shut up, now. Be very careful.

We don't know whether it's . . ." so on and so on. When you actually hit the top oppterm the needle tends to go mad. I mean, if you hit the top oppterm and it went tick and you got no tone arm action, no cognition, I would think at that moment you probably didn't have the top oppterm.

This is the way to look at it. You know, the expected manifestation is that he's going to get a lot of action out of this thing.

All right, there you are, you've got the top oppterm now, and there it is. Let the PC cognite on them. One of the tricks of 3M2 is, after you've given the PC his item, you sit still. That's one of the tricks. You sit still and let him cognite for awhile. When he kind of slows down on this whole thing, you put in your Prepcheck buttons—big mid ruts, just big mid ruds on this thing. Get as far as you can, or get as far as you can without annoying the PC. And call the item and you're going to see a gorgeous rocket read. And it's probably the first rocket read you will have seen in the whole operation.

See? Real slippery. That's real fancy. That's cutting corners. That's driving with one hand at ninety miles an hour with your feet on the top of the windshield. You understand? That's going around every corner on two wheels. That's making sure of nothing.

Now, I did that whole operation I have just accounted to you—did the whole operation—in two hours and fifty minutes. I don't expect you to do it in two hours and fifty minutes, but I'm not talking a theoretical procedure which hasn't been done.

I didn't find the service fac as part of that two hours and fifty minutes. That took me closer to six hours. Something that would make the tone arm go boom! boom! boom! boom! see? So I could turn it on—unburdened the case enough so the case could run. But then, every part—other part of the operation I've told you, and (now listen carefully) the PC on no goals list had ever put the present-time goal, including the operation I was conducting—had never put this goal on a goals list and didn't while I was straightening it out and checking it.

This was a goal that I had seen give half a rocket read four months ago. It went . Just accidentally called it. It was in a channel of implant goals, and couldn't get the implant goal to run, and yet the thing went POW! see? I saw it do half a fire; couldn't get any close to it. But ever afterwards, whenever you ticked it—called it—it ticked. Finally just said to the PC out of thin air, "Is that your own GPM?" Tick! And used it. It turned out to be the PT GPM. Interesting.

Now, that's what I mean by cutting around corners, because it's definitely against the law to give a PC a goal. PC had never, at any time, had ever said that was the PC's goal. So that's definitely against the law, and you shouldn't foist a goal off on the PC. And the only excuse I would have to do this is the PC did mention it at the time it went tick—you know, did half a rocket read. PC speculated on it for just an instant, months ago, and it was seen to fire.

So there were several other goals in this category that had been presented up at one time or another, but none of those ticked as the PC's own goal. You could call those off: "To disappear," see? "Now, is that your own actual goal?"—the deadest meter you ever saw, you see? To this, to that, you see? You know, "to be sexual," to be this, to be that, you know? Other kinds of goals that had from time to time been listed, you see? "Is that your own?" And all of them flunked the test; none of them would read. And finally I remembered this other one goal that I had seen read and mentioned that, and it went ping! And that was it. Never did see it rocket-read beyond a half-slash four months ago.

So this is done fast and rapidly, just from knowing the PC or from examining the PC's record very carefully. Now, supposing you inherit a new PC? Well, he's mentioned goals and he's thought of goals, and you look back through it again. And if you're real clever, you'll always draw a red-pencil box around any goal or an important datum of this kind so it's easily track-backable-to. See, that's very, very clever to do that on a PC's auditor reports, or print it big so that it's indicated well.

But in actual fact, I don't think the PC would have come up with this goal under interrogation. But there were several other goals, and on careful search I would have got one of those to read. Because when they were listed, laterly, they tried to do little quarter-inch RR slashes and they were the PC's actual GPMs.

In other words, here was a lot of points of interest. I'm just giving you the extreme case of an auditor, four months before, has seen a goal do a half-flash when the PC mentioned it—see, half a rocket-read. And then the auditor just runs out of chances, just on an indifferent—you know, just shuffle out a few cards—the auditor says, "Well, I don't know. Let's see, what goals have I seen, what have I ever seen rocket-read?" And pulls that goal out of the hat and calls it, says, 'Is that your own GPM?' Plang! See? You get the idea? But this is just auditor observation of what has fired on the PC. Well, that's driving with one hand on the wheel and your feet on the top of the windshield on a curving road at ninety miles an hour. You recognize that? Because that's cutting it awful close.

All right, but what did one wind up with? One not only wound up with the PC's service facsimile, with this exact operation I've given you: not only wound up with the PC's actual service facsimile but in a position to run the PC all the way to OT. Chugata, chutgata, chugata, chugata. See, twelve hours hence I will have that bank—the whole first GPM, every item found in it—all the way down and found back up to the top and cleaned up slick as a whistle, on the basis of an item every fifteen minutes, which is rather fast auditing but which can be done. That's one goal down.

But when you hit that one RI, see, that first RI—when you really hit it right on the button—that makes all the sense there is to make. This accounts

for all the present-time restimulation. This accounts for everything. And if you're only looking for service facsimiles, that method I have just given you I would very thoroughly recommend to you. Because it is safe to this degree: Supposing we had picked the wrong goal? Supposing on our goal-oppose lists we hadn't come anywhere near finding the next goal up? Supposing the many slips 'twixt cup and preclear had occurred? We could still turn around—put in the mid ruds for the session rather rapidly, turn around, get the PC some tone arm action before the end of the session. PC would feel good, ready to go again, see? See, that's all to the good. See? you're working it both ends from the middle.

You finally wind up with it. And it tells you, then, that the reason we have not been able to find goals on PCs is because of the overburden of the top oppterm and the top terminal. Accumulating, as they do, all of the debris of present time, they therefore mask the top GPM or any other GPM we are looking for.

There sits the PC with the roof pulled in. And of course you can't get him to rocket-read like that on his own actual goals. So his own actual goals have tended to stay a lost commodity. But we used to find them. Two or three years ago, we used to find them with a tick. Many a slip 'twixt cup and lip, man, but we still were able to find them with ticks. Now, if you find them and stack them in on an opposition—you know, "What goal would oppose (the goal you found)?"—and you're moving the guy on up to PT, moving him up to the PT GPM. You know now what it is. Now you list its top oppterm; you're going to find the PC's service facsimile. It's going to make all the difference in the world.

And all of that overburden is suddenly going to go btuuhhh-floof ! And so, of course, at that moment you don't call the goal, even. Just ignore it. You just got the top oppterm. It's going to rocket-read like mad. Well, anything that improved the rocket read to that degree, you're certainly on the GPM line. You haven't got anything misworded. There aren't any mistakes here, man.

So you're going to oppose this thing; you're going to get the next one and you're going to oppose that; and you're going on to the next and going to oppose; next one, going to oppose; next one, going to oppose; and go on down to the bottom of the bank. And finally you arrive at the bottom of it and you're going to clean that up. And you're going to list it right back on up to top again and you're going to see meter action, meter action, meter action, meter action, meter action.

Now he has a new problem. He has a new problem—brand-new problem now: He's against detectives, see—against detectives now. Can't read the newspapers without getting all restimulated—always coming into session restimulated. Terrible situation, you see? And we find that we've got a GPM something like that—"to be unlocated," or something, you see? We're running this and we handle it in the same way.

Of course we've got it now. And by running it properly and running it on down you're going to be . . .

The only fault you have in actually running GPMs is not following a sensible routine. Over listing, skipping banks, listing items backwards—these various traps and frailties and follies that you can run into; skip down over a whole GPM and start running the one below, leaving a whole GPM in place and then wonder why the PC is coming apart in the auditor's chair and not notice it.

But look, we have all of our lists—ARC Break Assessments. They're all data-assembly material now. You know what's going on. We got lots of things to prevent difficulties with, one way or the other. Used to do long, long, long,

... ∴

long, arduous, arduous, arduous, arduous—oh! terrible, aching, painful lists. A goal-oppose list of items to find a top oppterm, you see? Oh, my, my, my, my, on and on and on, a PC caving in. Everybody hated to do one of those things because it was too grim. Actually take the risk of asking the PC to do a “represent” on the top oppterm, see? “What might it be?” Do a list, you know? These things have simplified.

Doesn't say that you're not going to make mistakes doing it, see? Doesn't say that, because mistakes are there to be made. The picture I drew you yesterday is a picture of the bank and that's exactly what you're running. That way you not only find that datum which prevents observation in present time at any given instant, you also find the source of the datum, which is the goal, and all other data related to it, and then all other lower goals on which it appends and all other actions of whatever kind. When you get to the other end of the line you got an OT. You're directly on your line.

That's how it is done. The only security measure that you take in it is to make sure that your goal responds as the PC's goal, and make sure before you start on a bunch of listings and fumbblings around, of one kind or another, make sure—very, very sure—that you got an anchor to windward: can you produce tone arm action on this PC?

All right. There's a very neat package of clearing. That is based on the exact essentials, the construction of the human mind and on the truths I've given you in this lecture.

Wish you luck with it.

Thank you.