PARTS OF 3D

A lecture given on
30 November 1961

Thank you.

Now, this is the 30th of Nov. This Russian month is about to end. The month of "Nov." And we are about to let you in on some of the secrets of life, unraveling the case that has been run on Routine 3 and is being run on 3D and cases which will be run on 3D by you and the data which I am about to give you, you may not see anything of again, so you'd better unplug and tune in and get off the wavelength of Arcturus and onto the wavelength around here and I'll give you some dope, okay?

Now, not that you don't but, I mean, this is very serious, what I'm telling you. I'm very serious about this. You are going to be unraveling cases. Now, I don't care whether the case was run on Routine 3 or has been run on Khrushchev or somebody on 3D, you understand – I couldn't care less what case it is – you're going to be in the business of unraveling cases that have been misrun on existing procedures.

So you must know how to take apart a case and run a case that you get right straight off the street – the Glutz case – and in comes Miss Glutz. And Miss Glutz is seated in the auditing chair in the HGC and the auditor goes down the line *popeta-popeta-popeta-popeta, bangety-bangety-bangety-bang,* and he gets all the 3D items rather easily.

Now, you may very well be the one who is called upon to verify these items. And there's certain data which you have to know in order to verify items; not just sitting down and looking pretty and seeing if it falls on the E-Meter. You have to use your noggin on it. It – 3D goes together like a jigsaw puzzle. Tell you more about that in a moment. But that's one case. That's one case. That's the easy thing for you to do. That's a pipe; there's nothing to it. You can learn that. You can learn that. You can learn to do that standing on your head.

All right. Now we get the other thing. It wouldn't matter whether these are – techniques are released now or ten years from now, there'll always be some boob in upper Keokuk who will have got hold of them and while holding the E-Meter balanced on the tip of his nose, will have knocked the pc eighteen ways from the middle with the process.

Now, the very process that you're to use to clear the person has been abused on the pc. How are you going to unsnavel it and unravel it? Pretty interesting. Now you're getting into very, very interesting mental gymnastics.

All right. Let's take the least of these cases. Somebody comes in, says, "Well – uh, well uh – uh – uh – uh – an auditor up in – in Alaska found my goal and terminal for me about three years ago. And he ran it for quite a while, but uh – because I got sick, we couldn't continue the processing and so on."

You say, "Well, where's your goals list?"

"Oh, well, I don't know. We – goals list? Oh, that – that thing he had me write down up there. I don't know. Oh, I don't know where that went."

"Well, has there been a subsequent goal list?"

"Well, there's only that one that was done by an auditor down in Mexico when I was down there."

"Well, what happened to that goals list?"

"Well, I don't know."

"What was the auditor's name?"

"Well, I don't know. His name started with an H. He kept putting his thumb in pie. He – he said he was – couldn't get back into the United States anymore, but we don't have any goals list from that."

"Well, all right. Okay. Well, we'll start from scratch."

Now, it's horrible, you see, because the case in a nonrestimulated category can give you a fairly straight list of goals that got lots of tags on them, but after they've been run crisscross for a little while, the tags disappear.

And you should understand what a goals list is. Between us girls, a goals list has nothing to do with the ambitions of a pc. We ask for the ambitions of a pc, we ask for their desires and they give them to us quite earnestly and honestly and they think these are their desires and that is all very wonderful. But that isn't what we have asked for and that isn't what we get. We have asked for: one small, little, red flag fluttering in the breeze, telling us the route into the Goals Problem Mass. That's what we've asked for. We've asked for the biggest chunk of case that is visible and available at the first glance. That's what we've asked for and for some reason or other, the pc goes around waving this one, although it leads straight into hell's deepest inferno.

All right. So it's – it's merely a signal. That's all we care about. Of course, everybody loves this. They think this is wonderful. They say, "What did I want to do in life?" Well, we sure want to know what they wanted to do in life too but we get all kinds of misnomers.

Well, the fellow who wants to make cars: "Always wanted to make cars. Yes, I've always wanted to make cars. Everything's wonderful and I've always wanted to make cars. As a matter of fact, I was up in Detroit, studied automotive engineering. So I worked in Detroit

for a very long time and so forth. But just never made a go of it, you understand, but I've always wanted to make cars and so forth," and this checks out to be his goal.

Well, by the time we get down to it, we find the modifier is "crash." Who is the opponent of him making cars? Well, for some peculiar reason, the opponent to him making cars are – are horse drivers or something. We don't care what and their opposition goal, you see, is to – it wouldn't be to wreck cars – but their opposition goals is to keep cars off the road. Well, this gets very interesting because if the opposition goal is to keep cars off the road and his object is to make cars crash, he's got an awful lot of agreement, hasn't he, with his opposition? You'll find this is always the case. There's a tremendous amount of agreement sub rosa with the opposition. What's this mean?

Well, it means that our pc is going to dramatize at times the opposition goal and they always do. A pc will always dramatize to some degree, sometimes, the opposition goal. So it's part of his makeup and personality. He'll dramatize the opposition goal.

Now, the chances of his giving you the opposition goal as his goal in the first place is quite rare, unless it is something he suddenly thought of as he woke up in the morning because it was written on the wall.

Hence, we have this proviso: "Is it something that you really wanted to do in your lifetime?" We for sure must ask him that. Otherwise, he will give us the opposition goal which is stacked up and we'll assess out the opposition goal. And of course, the opposition goal will assess out as neatly as anybody else. There have been some examples of that. We have to ask the pc – there have been none in this unit. We have to ask the pc, then, "Did he himself ever want to do this thing in his lifetime?" That is how we make sure it's the pc's goal.

"Oh, well, yes," he says, "I wanted to do this. I just wanted to do this. Uh, yes, I wanted to make cars. I went up to Detroit. As a matter of fact, one time took a correspondence course in automotive engineering Never finished it, but I took it and so forth and I worked up in Detroit until I embezzled some f I mean, until I got fired and uh . . ." He'll get all kinds of oddball things, but *he* wanted to do it.

Now, the opposition goal is something that occurred to him suddenly. He sort of, however, at times has done it. You get the difference? At times he has *done* this. He never really wanted to do it, but he has *done* it. You follow this out? He's done it. He didn't want to do it. He didn't have any actual ambition to do this thing. He didn't have a desire to do this thing, but he did find himself doing it occasionally, after he thought of it. See, this has never really occurred consciously to him at all. He's thought of it.

I'll give you an example of that. "To find." Here's an example: He's thought of finding things. He's thought of going and finding things. Occasionally, he's found himself finding things, don't you see. But actually, he gets mad every time he tries to find anything So you'd ask this person, you'd say . . . Well, he comes in and he tells you, "Well, I just got up in the

morning and there were these letters across – you know, across the front of my mind and it was 'to find.' And that's – I know that's my goal. I know that's my goal." Sell, sell, sell, sell, sell, see.

You say, "Well, did you ever have a desire to do this?"

"Oh, well, yes, I've done it many times."

"No. Did you ever *plan* to do this thing?"

"Oh, well, no."

"Well, what happens when you do that thing? How do you feel when you are finding things?"

"Oh, mad as hell."

You say, "Fine. That's good." You can write down in a little side note, "Probable opposition goal, 'to find.'"

"Now, all right. Now, what have you wanted to do?" You go on with your listing. You go on with your listing You go on with your listing Oh, put "to find" in there if you want to get yourself in trouble, that's all right, but remember to use your head. The analytical tag of the reactive bank is that goal that the pc himself has wanted to do and remember there are many other tags and there are many other terminals and there's many other everything else in the reactive mind that can pop up and hit you in the face and can register and all that sort of thing. You understand? There's lots of things. But something that the pc really wanted to do.

It's more simple than it looks. It's just that after you have listed everything the pc said he wanted to do, let's make absolutely sure when we're checking the thing out, that it's something he at some time or another has planned to do, has actively done and how he felt about doing it. Because if he were emotional about doing it, that is to say if he were just screamingly angry every time he tried to find something – doesn't sound like much of a goal to us, does it? The fellow who wants to make cars was never screamingly angry when he went to Detroit, when he went into the shop. Maybe he couldn't make cars. But oh, he thought that was nice. He thought that was *nice. You* understand? That was *good.* That was a *nice thing to do* and that would please everybody. You get the conditions under which the goal is? Why? You want a high-toned attitude toward his goal, if you possibly can get it.

Now, I´ll show you. A Prehav terminal comes in, pardon me, a 3D terminal or an old 3 terminal comes in high on the Prehav Scale, the old numbered scale. Serene, marvelous, wonderful, beautiful, see. The terminal comes in. It's "a dirty skunk" is the terminal, see and it's "dirty skunk" is serene. It's quite fantastic.

He's in marvelous communication. He has *interest. You* see? Well, that just shows you the overwhumpingness of the terminal, don't you see? The higher toned the terminal is, the

lower toned is the pc. The pc himself, although he – this – he's a combination of all these things, he's practically out of sight. And there he is, stuck underneath all of this beautiful, high-toned beauty and serenity. You see this even on your graphs. The theetie-weetie case: Everything is lovely. You kick this person in the teeth, this person will say, "Thank you. Isn't that sweet."

You've got to watch this pc on an ARC break because you practically never know they have one. It operates the same mechanically because down deep the thetan knows he's got an ARC break. But the dramatization after you have said, "What the hell are you doing sitting down there in the chair? I told you to stand up. No, I mean stand – I mean sit down, stand up, uh, uh – don't sit down. Uh – uh – . Well, you don't have to pay much attention to that because it's just because you have a lousy temper this morning"

Anyway, the upshot of this thing is, is the pc has an ARC break. But you ask the pc, "Do you have an ARC break?" and the pc says, "Oh no, of course not. Forgive and forget, I always say." And yet you run ARC Straightwire or an ARC Process 1961 on this pc and he goes all over the dial. "Uhhhhhh, wow, wow, horrible, horrible, horrible," don't you see. I mean, they run it and run it and run it. You find they can't really talk to anybody, but it's all nice anyway.

Now, when you start running the terminal that lies at the other end of this goal, you'll find out that terminal comes *down* the Tone Scale and the pc, if you could assess the pc, just assess "you" on the Tone Scale – you never do this – you'd find out that the pc wasn't even *there* at the beginning of the assessment and then came up the Tone Scale little by little by little by little by little and eventually appeared. And this terminal is going down scale, down, down, down, down, down, down, down.

So, all right. The terminal *declines* on the Tone Scale, the pc *rises* on the Tone Scale. At the point where they cross, the pc and the dramatization of the terminal is a chromium-plated bitch. And the terminal, you see, is a bitch and the pc is a bitch and everything is messed up and they are very unhappy, and everybody is cross with everybody. You got the idea? It's some kind of *blaaaaa.* "How horrible life is!" you know. Because they've always been dependent on the beautiful serenity of being kicked in the teeth to bolster them up and that isn't there anymore. They have to make up their mind about what it is to get kicked in the teeth. Very well.

You've got this mechanism. The pc as a valence comes down scale and the pc as a being goes up scale – the actual pc, the thetan. Well, that occurs in terminals and so, therefore, it must occur in goal tone. And this fellow says, "Oh, I've always wanted to make cars. Isn't that interesting, making cars." Interest? You know where interest is?

"Oh, yes, I'm very interested in making cars. I'm always talking to everybody about making cars. Cars, cars, cars, cars. Oh, yes, yes, very nice. That's a lovely goal." That is a

worthwhile thing to do and you'll find when you've got a real goal by the teeth that you can depend on and set your sextant by from there on out – which is what you're doing in 3D – that it is a fairly high-toned attitude toward that goal.

Now, when you have a low-toned attitude toward the goal, it'll come along with the fact, "Did you ever want to do this, really?" and the person says, "No, I just do it."

Well, haven't you asked for a prima facie dramatization? Has he ever wanted to do this? Is this ever something he wanted to be, to have, or to do? And then this is capped by the question, "How do you feel when you do that?"

"Oh," he says, "I feel good when I do that." You're all set.

Now, he says, "Well, as a matter of fact, whenever I – I don't know. 'To find things'? How do I feel about it? Well, I try to find things – try to find things. I don't know. Find things, some way. You know, it's a hell of a nuisance having to find things! You know they get lost? People purposely misplace them on you? And you know every morning I try to get my cuff links and somebody has purposely misplaced them and so forth? I almost go out of my mind trying to find that sort of thing And people shouldn't . . ." It sounds awfully motivatorish, doesn't it, and so on.

Well, you can take – that is a nice final check on whether you've got the person's goal. Is it something they had an ambition for or is it something they have done, "Damn it!" See the difference? Because the one they've done, "Damn it!" is probably the opposition goal and they will both check out. They will check out equally on the E-Meter. They will check out gorgeously.

Fortunately for you, you almost never get – it's very rare that you will get the opposition goal on the pc's goal list if you simply ask for "things which you have wanted to do," "ambitions you've had," "things which you have desired," "secret ambitions you've had," that sort of thing. Oh, that's fine. That goes right along, and you get the list.

But if you were to ask generally, "What ideas have you obeyed?" you see, you'd also get all the opposition terminal goals. "What ideas have you obeyed?" That isn't what you're asking him, so the very questions which get you the goals list weed out this thing and the probability of your getting an opposition goal is very small, but is not impossible. You must remember that: that it's not impossible to get the opposition goal.

Now, when you get the opposition goal, your 3D is all upside down, of course. You look at the 3D form, you look at the items on it – well, you're trying to assess the opposition and the pc won't assess worth shucks. In other words, you can get the opposition goal, put it down as the pc's goal and then of course you're going to get as the pc's terminal, the opposition terminal.

Then what are you going to have to get as the pc's terminal? You wind up, of course, in trying to get the pc's terminal . . . Well, you've got it! It's the opposition terminal for the goal you've got and you see the thing is all backwards, isn't it. But it can still be worked out. And this is all I want to teach you in this lecture about 3D. It doesn't matter how upside down and backwards the thing finally comes. Certain errors or difficulties that you encounter in assessment serve as diagnostic points for you.

So we – the first test, as I say, is it something the pc wanted to do, wanted to be or wanted to have? Was there a desire back of this? And if there was no desire back of it and if the pc's attitude toward it is very suspicious and very upset – oh, yes, you've assessed something. Yes, yes, yes, you've assessed something and actually could work out a full 3D from it. You've assessed the opposition goal. Remember, it'll fall equally with the pc's goal.

Why will it fall equally? Well, get the idea of two tractors meeting head-on in a field. One is driven by the opposition goal – the idea is the driver there – and it's the opposition tractor and the other one, idea, is driven by the (quote) "pc's idea" and it is the pc's tractor. And in trying to pull these two tractors apart, if you don't pull the pc's tractor off, the pc will practically blow away in the resulting winds of *bluuuuuhh. You* see? In other words, the opposition tractor has the quality of spraying with poison gas the pc's tractor. You got the idea? But the pc's tractor doesn't have the same thing because the pc won't suffer.

You can do almost anything you want to *to* an opposition terminal except treat it as the pc's and when you treat it as the pc's, the pc will look like he's getting his head blown off. He actually will. His face will press in, the wind will go across his face and to give you a subjective reality, after you've got a 3D formed sometime, don't get it run, but ask your auditor, "All right. I'm game for anything. Assess my opposition terminal on the Prehav Scale please." And that single action, if you get somebody to do it for you – won't hurt you any; leave you upset for an hour or so; it doesn't matter – you'll learn from that the terrific sensation you get off one of these opposition – working constantly with the opposition terminal-l-l-l-*zzz*. You're being blown away all the time. Honest, it's like some kind of a little electronic windstorm going on. There is something happening If you've really go – if that's the proper opposition terminal, somebody assesses this thing on the Prehav Scale for you, just the constant repetition of it and trying to find its level and putting the action in it will give you the same sensation a pc would get if he were being run on it accidentally. It almost blows him away. It's something on the order of having a big electric fan in front of him, going at about a thousand foot-pounds of thrust. It's sort of something that doesn't want him there.

Now, if you've got the pc's tractor in this smash, you can pull that tractor away and take it to the garage. But the opposition tractor, you have really no control over at all. So it is necessary to get the *pc's goal* and the *pc's terminal* and run it as the pc's goal and the pc's terminal. It is necessary to have the opposition goal and it is necessary also to have the opposition terminal. But remember, that one can't be towed away. It isn't the pc's.

If you're going to take the problem apart, in other words, the half that is called "opposition" doesn't audit well. You audit it a little bit to keep it restimulated. Otherwise, you won't keep the pc located at the goals-mass point. See, well, every once in a while you say, "Hey, start up the engine of that other tractor." *Broooom, brooooom, brooooom.* "That's enough. That's enough. That's enough."

Now, you can start up its engine so thoroughly that if you have the same number of commands containing opposition terminal as you have pc's terminal, you'll lock the pc up right there. It makes for terribly fast, very uncomfortable run. *Brrrr!* Both tractors are in gear, going forward, both accelerators are on the floorboard.

Now, if you want to really have a mess, run a five-way, ordinary, run-of-the-mill, garden-variety bracket. If you really want to have a mess, run some old command that was perfectly easily run on some Dynamic Assessment terminal and didn't do too much. Try to clear up a 3D Goals Problem Mass with some old process of that kind. And use the opposition terminal in it to the same degree that you use the pc's terminal and you will see exactly what I am talking about.

Both engines are in full, but all wheels are skidding But the amount of friction which is coming out of the bumper-to-bumper situation would make people deafen for miles around, because they won't move it. Nothing will move. Actually, you could probably audit it for years on one of the old-type things, and you would never get anyplace. Tone arm would simply go up to about 5.5 and stick and eventually all you'd have to do is say to somebody either his opposition terminal or his goals terminal, either one, and the tone arm would promptly fly to the stick point. *Pang!* It'd stay – it might stay there an hour; it might stay there two hours; it might stay there two weeks, but it would go right up to that stick point. *Bang!* Because you've got a head-on crash and that head-on crash is what keeps the reactive bank reactive and what keeps it there and which keeps it poised in time. And that's what makes it a reactive bank. And that's how come it can stay with the pc. And that's how come the pc dramatizes it and all the other things that we've been studying for years are contained in this Goals Problem Mass. They're right there. You don't have to run engrams. Run these two masses; you've got it all set.

Because the pc has this overwhelming ambition – modified slightly – and the opposition has an equally overwhelming ambition – modified not at all and these two things are head-on.

All right. Now, in sorting this out, the North Star, your Polaris, in the navigation of this particular problem, is the goal. So please get the goal. Whatever else you do, get the goal.

Now, if you get something from a goals list, which assesses out beautifully and continues to fall – just routine assessment. Assessment is not hard. You'd think, to some

auditors, it was terrible, but it is not hard. But assessment becomes as hard as you're knuckleheaded about what you're trying to assess.

We've got the pc's terminal over as the opposition terminal – I'll give you an idea, see – we've got the pc's terminal over as the opposition terminal and now we're trying to find the pc's terminal. How long do you think we could go on?

We've already got it on the 3D sheet. Nothing else is going to fall on the 3D sheet, but we keep asking him for sweetness-and-light terminals to put down as his own terminal.

Well, this opposition terminal is a dirty dog, see and he isn't going to ever admit to being a dirty dog, but he is one. It's his terminal. That's quite interesting How long do you think we could assess for this terminal which is already down under the heading, "opposition terminal." It's already there. And we're going to keep on assessing for it to put it down as the – we're trying to find the pc's terminal. Well, we found it. It's overlisted under the opposition terminal. That's where it is. And what have we got as the pc's goal? We've got the opposition goal, that's what we've got. So we've just got two sections misfilled in. You got the idea?

From that point on, everything becomes unworkable. So that's why the lodestar of the goal has to be so clearly defined as something the pc wanted to do. We want a high-toned, beautifully serene, "Wouldn't it be lovely," "Everybody would love us desperately," "This would heal all the problems of Earth, that is for sure" – that's what we want. He won't put it that strong ordinarily, but you say, "Well, did you ever want to make cars?"

"Oh, yes, yes, I'd never thought about it before, but you know, I do. I've always – yes, yes."

"Well, how do you feel when you start making cars?"

"Well, I get very interested, and so forth and very nice, and so on."

"Well, you ever talked to people about making them?"

"Oh, yes, yes. Talk all the time about making cars," and so on.

Oh, hell, you've got his goal, man. I mean, there's nothing to that. It's high-toned. You must have his goal. There it is.

All right. Now, we get something else. We say to this pc . . . All right. We go down the list and we got this goal "to find things." And we say to the pc, "All right, now . . ." We checked it out. We got it. We know it falls, we know it's perfect. See, you realize that all five first parts and actually the Prehav level, all six parts of a 3D fall equally. And they stay in equally. And they're assessable equally. You've just got to find out which one is which. That's all.

And we say to this fellow, "All right. Now, how about 'finding things,' now, we've got this goal here." That's – we didn't find any other goal; we just found this one goal. "To find

things." And we'd write this down and we've assessed everything off and we finally wind up with the thing, "to find things."

And we say, "Well, where did this come from, now? Did you ever wanted to find things?" is what you really ask the pc.

"I've gone a lot of places to look for things."

Well, you say, "Good. Good. Have you ever *wanted* to find things?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, I have. I – I – I – I've studied an awful lot of – of – of ways and means of locating"

"So, have you ever wanted to find anything?"

"Well, it goes without saying. Of course. Naturally."

"Well, how do you feel when you're looking for something?"

"Oh, well, how do I feel – how does anybody feel? You feel like hell when you're looking for things, of course."

Well, you've got a piece of 3D. Don't kick that out. You've got a piece of 3D; that's for sure. But please recognize that it's probably the opposition goal.

Now, if you were – if you were the person standing between the bumpers of these two tractors, you might not know which tractor you were. They're sort of grinding and champing, don't you see? And there's a lot of shouting and swearing going on between the drivers and you might get disoriented at this point and you might not really know which was the wrong tractor. And you might appropriate equally both tractors; they'll both assess. The Fordson tractor will assess equally with – as far as it's concerned – just another Fordson tractor. They're all Fordsons, aren't they? It's this kind of an assessment as far as the E-Meter is concerned.

So you look over into this situation and you put it down. You have assessed something. You don't invalidate it. You don't tell the pc what it is or anything else, but you know where to put it, and you don't put it down as the pc's goal, if you please. You leave it in abeyance. And then we try to find the opposition goal to it. Smart, huh? Try to find the opposition goal to this thing

You get a whole new list and the pc somehow or another . . . And if we very carefully – if we've suspected it this far, we don't say, "Your goal of," because that's an evaluation. We just say "the goal of." See, "What would oppose the goal of finding things? What would oppose that goal?"

We get a whole new goals list. The pc's goal will appear on it. And we finally, just by assessment, we get one of these items and there it is, bang There it is.

And we say, "All right, have you ever wanted to do this thing?" And it's "to get lost." Well, obviously, the noble thing to do is to find things. And the ignoble thing to do is to get lost. Everybody agrees on this.

And the pc says to you, "Oh, yes, I'm always trying to get lost. It's so interesting."

"Well, have you ever talked to anybody about getting lost?"

"Well, yes, as a matter of fact, I wrote a book on the subject one time." Very high-toned. Oh, yes, everybody would be interested in getting lost. See? Bang

So we've got, "to find things" on one side and the opposition terminal, of course, is "to get lost." The opposition goal is "to get lost," as far as he's concerned or we were concerned – unless we know what part we're looking for. We found the pc's goal backwards. Simple. He's low-toned about the opposition goal and he's high-toned about his own goal. That's what – that's a rule of thumb.

When the opposition goal is chanted to him, he kind of feels a little bit overwhelmed and he starts sort of leaning backwards and he wonders if the high winds of space haven't started to blow. And you start chanting at him his own goal and he says, "Isn't that wonderful?" He feels so relaxed about it. Of course, it's the source of his ulcers, but he feels it's real nice. It's real nice. This whole thing is real nice. Made him feel better.

And you say "to get lost," "to get lost," "to get lost," "to get lost," "to get lost." And this winds of space idea of blowing his head off or something of the sort just diminishes and lessens and goes away.

So we could just watch the pc. We're going to get the same reaction on the E-Meter. The E-Meter does not know friend from foe. It doesn't. It doesn't know which side it's reading And we couldn't care less. Just as long as it'll read and tell us that it's in the fight. That's all we want to know.

The E-Meter will tell us it's part of the fight. *Aaaagh-guuu.* We could actually go ahead and almost blindly find the parts of 3D and jigsaw them together, see. We could find *a goal,* and then we could find *a goal* that opposed that goal, and then we could find *a terminal* for one of the goals and *a terminal* for another one of the goals. And just by gradual lessening and discussion with the pc, we would eventually – the pc would all of a sudden say, "Hey, that's *me.* And that other one, that's *them."* And man, I don't mean – mind telling you, he won't change his mind after that.

Yeah, he *knows* which side of the fence he's on. It's somehow or another with a little abashment sometimes, hell tell you, "Well, actually – headwaiter – an uptown swell. I've never been an uptown swell. I've just been a headwaiter. And my goal is 'headwaiter.'"

Well, you can check it out easily enough. You don't have to bother with too much guesswork on the part of the pc because he's, of course, mixed up. He's not a reliable judge of

this situation. You just sit there and say, "Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell."

The pc's head's going back and "Uptown swell. Uptown swell. Uptown swell."

You say, "Fine. Thank you very much. Headwaiter. Headwaiter. Headwaiter. Headwaiter."

And the pc, "Headwaiter. Headwaiter. Yeah, makes you feel pretty good. Yeah, headwaiter, that's nice. That's – that's good. *Whew.* That's – that's nice.

I like that. Yes, us headwaiters, it's – so on." He'll never do that with "uptown swell." You'll never see him pat his top hat on his head. You'll just see him lean backwards. He cannot dramatize successfully the opposition terminal and has never been able to.

He's tried. Every once in a while, he'll try. I guess a guy caught between the bumpers of two tractors with unlimited horsepower, each one driving at each other, I suppose he – he can't quite make up his mind *what* to try. But that's about the way the pc is.

All right. Let's look at this then. You've got, now, an opposition terminal and an opposition goal and a pc's terminal and a pc's goal and then we've got a modifier. And we're not going to bother to modify – the only goal we're going to modify, of course, is the pc's goal.

We could also modify the opposition goal. We can find modifiers for it too. We can go on and bat our brains out, but after we've found the modifiers for it, so what? Maybe someday we'll find some use for it and I will tell you, "You know that lecture I made back there on the 30th of November on the subject of never find the modifier for the opposition goal? Well, as a matter of fact, we need it. Process Zed is absolutely vital that we have this." So take a rain check on it, if that's the case. But right now we have no particular use to find it.

All right. This thing is going to make a picture. It's going to make a picture and the pc knows. The pc is never really going to argue seriously about his own terminal. But the pc'll be awful queasy about an opposition terminal when it's handed to him as his own terminal. He doesn't think that's quite right. Because every time he thinks about that being his terminal, the winds of space start going.

"I don't know if that could quite be my terminal."

He thinks about his own terminal, and all he gets is a horrendous, horrible headache. That's much preferable to being blown off the cliff, see. You get the difference between these two things?

All right. Jigsawing these things together has got to make a story and it's absolutely vital that it make a story. It's got to make sense – *to you.*

Now, never suggest anything to the pc. But when you've got the elements, what they are, you will have to sort out. And if they have all checked out nicely and you know there are all parts of it, before you run this pc, you make up your mind if it makes a story to you.

For instance, does the opposition goal really belong to the opposition or is it the pc? And that's an easy test. "What have you really wanted to do?" chanted at the pc – it blows his head off, it's the opposition goal. Fine. He – he really wanted to do it. It's his goal. He – he gets mad when he tries to do it, why, that's the opposition goal. You got the idea? So that – that's easy to sort out, that one is.

All right. Opposition terminal. Now, this requires a little more sense. The opposition terminal must be somebody who would have a goal of that type who would actually be opposed to the pc's goal. It mustn't be "a kangaroo catcher in southern Andalusia." The pc's terminal has gotten to be an uptown swell, you see. "Uptown swell and a kangaroo catcher and . . . Doesn't sound – there's something wrong here someplace."

The way you straighten it out is by thorough checking again. Just check it out again. See? Just – just make sure it's right at that point. Just check it out quietly. Because you're going to find that it's got to look like a fight. For instance, what locks a problem together? What locks a problem together? "To find things," "to lose things."

They must be opposing ideas, and the ideas must be quite clearly opposing And if they're not clearly opposing, you *do a recapitulation* and if you don't do your recapitulation of the thing, you're in trouble, because you'll be running something that is off beam.

Now, it can happen that it doesn't sound that way to you, but it makes sense to the pc. Well, I buy that right up to the point it doesn't make sense to me.

Oh, come on, wake up, don't be so serious. It's all right for the pc to say that it makes perfect sense to him to have, "the uptown swell" and "a kangaroo catcher in southern Andalusia." Perfectly makes sense and for the opposition goal to be "to catch kangaroos" and the pc's goal to be, "to light cigars." This is fine. He says, well, it all makes sense to him and I take that, I buy that, I say that's just fine, right up to the point where I can't understand it. If it doesn't look like it to me and if it wouldn't sound like it to a screenwriter and if it wouldn't be understood by the general public if put in a short story and a bunch of other things like that, I have now learned by experience that it won't stand up on a run.

I've learned this by experience, because pc after pc now, on 3D, has said, "It makes sense to me" and it didn't make any sense to me – not to me, it didn't make any sense. And every one of them – you can ask Suzie – I've said to Suzie, "That isn't it. Nah-uh! Somebody's skidding their wheels someplace. That isn't it."

And sure enough, on checkouts and runs they haven't made sense. It wasn't because I think they've got to be redone. If we didn't redo them, somebody'd get killed in the process of

being audited. That's all. Do you see what I mean? And it's just coincidental that they – the right ones when now relocated make sense! The terminal agrees with the – with the guy I know that the pc is, see? It agrees with his past and background and he does these things. Yeah, we know this. And he has these goals, and yeah, boy, does he hate this other item like mad, you know. He wouldn't have anything to do with that. That's obvious.

And that other item wouldn't have anything to do with the pc's item. And, yes, this goal does confront the other goal. Oh, yeah, that's fine. And the modifier – yeah, we'd suspect something like that about this pc. It all makes sense and you say, "Now we know!" See? And if the auditor can't say, "Now we know," he'd better keep fumbling with pieces of paper. That's all I've got to say.

He never suggests anything to the pc. It's up to him to find more items and to try to straighten this out until it makes sense and suddenly, like a crash of lightning, he's liable to get something on the basis of – from the pc – "Oh, well, yes, I . . . *Hu-hu-hu-hu.* Oh, yes, I don't see why I ever tried to sell you the idea that I was a Canadian Mounted Policeman. I – I don't see why I ever tried to sell you that idea. Yes, it's absolutely true. It's absolutely true. I was a sausage maker in Vienna. That's right. I always have been. I always wanted to make sausages. Yeah, that's right. I don't think I ever told you this before, but as a matter of fact . . ." And what are we getting? We're getting the upper strata of the Tone Scale. We're getting a pc talking We're getting a pc talking about it, a pc interested in it. We're getting the whole upper Tone Scale about all this and worse than that, it fits. Makes sense. Makes sense. There's been a pc or two around where nothing made sense, you know?

Sometimes it doesn't make sense until you get all of the pieces and all of a sudden you'd say, "Of course. Naturally! Well yes, all right!" Up to that time, you only had four items. They didn't make any sense.

Maybe one was "a juggler," and the other and the goal of the thing was "to shoot clay pipes," and just all the *bluuh* and all of a sudden you get the fifth item, you know? You know, like the pc's terminal and it'll all of a sudden will go, *clank! You* know? All goes into place very nicely. You say, "Yep, that's the pc. Yep, that's this and that's that, and that's the goal, and that's it – *boom, boom, boom."*

You never argue with the pc on this subject. You just either test it out, get more items, check it out, look it over, know what's gone before and all of that. That – that's what you do. That's how you handle the situation basically. You know what's gone before. That is your best bet.

And it makes sense to you finally and until it makes sense to you, keep assessing, keep moving things around and don't get so confoundedly set – just because you wrote at the top of the piece of paper that these were opposition terminals – don't get so fixated on the idea that they absolutely become opposition terminals. They might not at all. It can check out 100

percent and appear as the pc's terminal. Just because you've assessed for the opposition terminal and found something is no reason that you've found the opposition terminal, at all. But given any couple of parts of 3D, you can always straighten it out. You can always ask a cross question that gives you the other parts, which is quite interesting.

Let's say we knew this pc was assessed at some time or another and somebody found a goal on him and it had been run and evidently fairly successful. And we had the terminal on the thing and it appeared to be his terminal and so on. And that was all very well. And it did check out and as a matter of fact still bangs. And we can still get a bang on this thing on the meter. Well, just because he said it was his terminal, is no reason it's his – isn't his opposition terminal. See, you've got a piece of the puzzle and now I'm talking about putting cases together, see?

Well, the easiest way to put a piece – a case together, of anybody ever run on Routine 3 – the easiest thing in the world to do is just take "What goal?" "What terminal?" and then conditionally put the goal down as the pc's goal and conditionally put the terminal down as the pc's terminal.

Now, find quite noncommittally, an opposition goal – *ha-ha!* – and then find an opposition terminal and check those things out on their list, which now leaves you with four items. You're not committed yet. One or the other of the goals you have found is the pc's goal. One or the other of them is the opposition goal. See, you've assessed it out and the assessment checked.

One or the other of the terminals is the opposition terminal and the other one is the pc's terminal. Well, you're – this is pretty easy now, by this time. Your test is – all you have to do is chant it at him; if it blows his head off, it's the opposition. I mean, simple. I mean, you can even subject it to actual mechanical tests. It doesn't have to be by your opinion.

Now, the opposition terminal, goal; opposition anything, opposition level – these things all start the winds of space. They start blowing the pc's head off and that's for sure. This you can count on – starts blowing the pc's head off

It isn't that things get more solid. Don't use that as a test, for God sakes. They'd better get more solid, but you've got that. You actually get a current. It's actually a current starts going. I mean, you're talking about winds. You're not talking about mass.

You chant the opposition, you can start up a sort of a mass wind. You start up a wind and you start up the – the pc's goal or terminal and it just kind of gets more solid and he feels happier and he feels kind of less there and foggier. He doesn't feel good, you understand, but it's fine. It's fine. It's interesting, it's at a high communication state, it's fine. And the other isn't. The other is misemotional.

After you've assessed and run, now you really start getting the dope. You start running the opposition terminal as the pc's terminal and you promptly have an awful mess on your hands.

Now, here's about what happens: The pc comes in *low* on the Prehav Scale. That is to say that your first levels that the pc gets alive will be relatively low levels. That's – gives you a probability of opposition terminal. You're running his opposition terminal by mistake.

The pc runs kind of – doesn't know anything about what's going on; knows nothing about what is going on and can't tell you anything about what is happening and cannot do it very well and so forth. Well, it's not necessarily the opposition terminal. It's just probably the wrong terminal. I can tell you how you'll find it's the wrong terminal, in any time and case. It's very simple. It runs this lifetime and runs everything the pc has run into before in processing. Isn't that nice?

It runs mainly this lifetime and it never goes into any past lives or any nasty things like that and it runs all of the things the pc has already had run. See, the pc's had this and that and the other thing run on their case down through the years and that's what the pc contacts again.

You have found a lock. The terminal you have found is just a lock on the actual terminal and checked out sporadically and was detectable from the first. It was just – actually, a bad piece of assessing and checking. That you can count on.

So when a pc starts to run and they give you the answers... They're pretty hard to answer the auditing commands. That's about the first thing you run into. Oh, there's something wrong with the auditing commands here, but can't really answer any of the auditing commands. It's always difficult to answer anyhow, but, you know, just can't quite answer any of the auditing commands. They don't really apply somehow or another. And the incidents they get – well, they get last week and they get tomorrow and they get their childhood and they get their family home life and they get the garage they worked at and they get their childhood and they get the class and they get eating dinner today and. . . You better make up your mind. You're just running a lock. You're not running any terminal that's ever going to do the pc any good, because you haven't contacted the Goals Problem Mass.

There aren't any clear pictures in a Goals Problem Mass for a nickel and a collar button. After you've run it for just a few levels of pictures – picturesmictures – there's a little fragment of this and you get a far impression that over there someplace there might be . . . And it's all sort of dark down here, but you get the idea of a fragment of a toy on the floor, you see.

And then that's – that's pictures. Well, what kind of pictures would you get if you put an art gallery between two bulldozers? Well, that's the kind of pictures you'd get, that's all.

You don't get nice, clear – this is on early runs, of course – you don't get beautiful 3-D pictures. You – the pc's terminal is a waterbuck and we get – we think it is – you see. And we get this beautiful stream and it's all in 3-D and the tone arm stays down and the tone arm just stays down and the tone arm never goes anyplace and nothing ever happens. But you get these beautiful pictures of these 3-D situations. It's a nice picture, too. It's sweet. There's nothing happening in them.

No, they're not stuck. And that actually will be the characteristic of some lock terminal. You'll find the terminal. It's probably on the original list. When you find the terminal eventually, you will be able to connect it to the terminal you were running. So you're running a late terminal, that's all. It never goes anyplace. And of course it's got pictures. What do these pictures depend on? They depend on the Goals Problem Mass like the – a ship depends on an anchor, you see? And you've got – after that, you've got pictures on the subject.

No, it's like running head-on into a brick wall. Clearing, actually, is not nice. And if you're looking for some nice, sweet procedure, why you know, be an art critic and don't get audited. Spend all your time in the galleries where it's quiet and serene and nothing ever happens.

No, you start running an actual terminal, on its proper Prehav level, against its proper opposition terminal. And you run it properly with the pc with his own terminal and the opposition terminal being that one over there, not running the pc on the opposition terminal with his own terminal over there, you see. That's even worse; and it's just a dog's breakfast anyhow from there on out. And don't think because there's something happening and the arm – tone arm is sticking up, that you must have done something wrong No, it's quite the reverse. If the tone arm stays down and nothing happens, you've done something wrong. That's all.

But even if you're running the pc on the opposition terminal, something's going to happen. The pc eventually gets a part in his hair, eventually gets a hole through his forehead. He's running straight into the currents of the – of the actual magnetic fields that surround this confounded thing. It's quite fascinating

All right. Patching them up after they've been run is something you'd better be cognizant with, because frankly, there have been four people in this unit assessed and run on Routine 3 who were run on their opposition terminals as their own terminal. And you go back and look. That's why Suzie is scolding – we really had – I was really looking over – over early auditing reports, and it says, "He squiggled kabub. Ran *rrrr-mmm.*" "Process. Process." Next auditing report, "Process." Next auditing report, "Process." You go back earlier. "Process," it says. So what process? Let's go back three or four more days. Were they running the terminal at this time? "Process." Go back three or four more days. Blank.

And you finally find over in a corner someplace, it says, *"Hmph-phllhmm-hmm."* And you say, "What in the name of God was that? Where is that? Where is that?" And you break

out – actually did – break out magnifying glasses and so forth and try to read the damn thing. Finally found most of it, too.

Because if it was the pc's terminal – now this is a rule – if it was the pc's terminal, it must be run from the first level it was assessed, onward. You must pick up the first level it was ever run on. And you mustn't skimp one. And if you've skimped one, you've had it, Henry!

I found a nice one last night. I found somebody that was being run on their right terminal clear back in September and who just would have done gorgeously, but the auditor never ran the terminal the pc was clearly assessed upon, but ran something else as a terminal and that pc has hung up ever since.

I was sitting down here in the training office at 4:30 A.M. this morning. And I was tearing through the records and that is what I found. You talk about a flub. The pc would probably be Clear by this time because we had the right terminal, it was all running okay and the auditor just assessed the first level and then said, "It must be something else." The pc even said – the pc is terribly interested in this level – and ran something else from there on. And the first level found on the Prehav Scale on this pc has not even been run to this day! I trust the pc did or will run it today, much to the surprise of the auditor, who is probably. . .

There are three of – several auditors here today opened their folder – pc's folder with great confidence and aplomb, thinking they were going to get on with the show and were suddenly confronted with running a terminal and had the level already in front of them to run now on the pc and probably expressed their consternation by not running them.

Anyway, they were all set up. We needed the rest of the thing. You actually needed the rest of the picture. You had to have the rest of the picture or otherwise you would never have gotten any part of it.

The original terminal on which a pc was run, was not however, necessarily the right terminal. It was not necessarily the opposition terminal, you see? It was not necessarily any of these things. But it's whether or not it checks out and makes sense, whether or not originally it did run, whether or not it fits it, whether – you know, all of these other considerations were there.

For instance, I'll just give you a quick flash through. here now. Talking about patching him up.

Let me say one final word about putting together a 3D. It's a jigsaw puzzle. It fits together and it makes a perfect picture after you've got it finished, that's it. That's the way it works and so forth. And it tests out and checks out and that's the way it looks to the pc and that's the way it is.

Now, you needn't be terribly worried about having done a reversewise assessment and all of a sudden run the pc on the opposition terminal. The pc is going to feel very bad and you're going to feel – everything's going to feel very upset, but of course the pc's going to feel bad and upset anyhow on an early run. So that's not a test. It's whether or not you suddenly wake up to the fact that this pc has been sitting there with a high wind going across the front of their face for the last session. It's about time to say, "Well, wait a minute, is this the opposition terminal or isn't it?" And you suddenly look into the folder and say, "Does this make sense? Well, hell, this has never made sense. This just has never made sense. Well now, how would it make sense?"

And all of a sudden we move it around, we swap the terminals or swap the goals or we swap any of them or we find "Well, gee-whiz, last year you were assessed on – you were assessed on 'a buggerboo.' You never told me that."

"Oh, well yes, I had 175 hours of run on a buggerboo. Didn't I ever tell you that? I never did."

You have been running as the opposition terminal, "a boss." "A boss." "A boss" is the opposition terminal. And the only terminal you could find on the pc was "a little fairy." And then we find out that last year he was assessed as "a carpenter." Of course, that's his terminal! Checks out now. "The boss," "the carpenter." Yes, what is the goal of a carpenter? You get the idea? It was – had to be a Routine 3 goals terminal type of run and check. Yes, yes. It ran. Everything was fine, but just somehow the pc is not interested anymore and he neglected to mention it. That's the kind of things you'll sometimes run into. You have to be alert to this kind of thing in patching them up.

Now, in view of the fact that people who have been run on Routine 3 have been badly assessed or well assessed, you've got to reprove-out the whole situation. But if they can remember their goal and if they can remember their terminal, for any given run you can work out the rest of the 3D like scat and then try and make sure that the goal wasn't an oppgoal and that the terminal wasn't the oppterminal. You got the idea? Find the rest of the items of the 3D and you've got the person set up for a run. Fill him into your commands of 30 November and commands of 28 November.

There have been three sets of commands: 27 November, 28 November and 30 November. Thirty November can – is your best issue because it gives you a choice of whether or not you're going to run straight on into the tractor or you're going to fool around a little bit before the head-on collision.

I could explain more to that later. You don't particularly need the data at the moment. But you can so write up the sixteen-way bracket so that it's a head-on collision. How? By putting more oppterminals in it. You put the oppterminal into more commands. When you put the opposition terminals – the more opposition terminals you're going to put into more

commands, the more the pc is going to run on, head-on into it, the more difficulty the pc is going to have, the more headache the pc is going to have, the faster they go Clear.

So you just pays your money and you say, "Well, how fast are we going to get this fellow Clear or how slow are we going to get this fellow Clear? How much fooling around are we going to do before we walk in to the middle of the bullpen?" And, of course, you can just take and throw him into the middle of the bullpen. All you have to do is run it the way it is issued here on 30 November. "Tell me a problem, oppterm." is number thirteen. And number fifteen, "Tell me a problem you might have had with an oppterm." Of course, that's you versus the oppterm, *ha-ha; you* versus the oppterm, *ho-ho-ho. Zzuhh.* Of course, you've never been really versus the oppterm except as the term, and *huuwoooooo.* The winds of space will start to turn on at that moment and then you catch it the next command. And you're right back there – terminal, terminal. But there's more terminals here than there are oppterms. On 27 November you'll find there's the same number of opposition terminals in the command bracket as there are terminals. I will state to you in passing that it took me a couple of weeks to finally settle on this and discover irrevocably that we have never had a command big enough, beefy enough and tough enough to run a Goals Problem Mass. We had never had one. Except this and this is big enough and beefy enough and tough enough. And if it won't run and the pc can't do it, it's just because you, knucklehead, haven't clarified the level with the pc or gotten the intensity of the level, knucklehead. So that's all there is to that.

Let me catch you running, "How might 'failed pinch' have been a solution to the problem?" The pc at the time you first brought this up was saying, "Failed pinch. Failed pinch? Failed pinch. How do you fail a pinch?"

And you've said, "All right. Now, we got to clear the rudiments and here's the first command."

And the pc says, "It was failed pinch, failed pinch, failed to pinch. I'm finding it difficult to answer."

Well, one of the reasons they find it difficult to answer is when it's not their terminal. When it – when it's the opposition terminal, they also find it difficult to answer. When it's the wrong terminal, it's always difficult to answer. If it's the wrong Prehav levels, it's difficult to answer and when it's the wrong intensity – this is a whole new subject on the Prehav – the wrong intensity.

How might slapping have been a solution to that problem? You're all set, see? "Slapping" is what the Prehav level is. There isn't such a level, but you say, "Slapping That's what we assessed, you see. Slapping" So we say, "Well, all right." We go on and run the command. It doesn't run.

And you say, "Well, all right. Now let's get smart on this thing and let's get the intensity of it. Slapping, hitting, beating, smashing, slugging, crushing. Crushing, there it is,

heh-heh-heh-heh, crushing." Or we got "crush" on the Prehav Scale, but we try to run the thing and it's "tapping"

"Tapping Yes, tapping would be a solution to the problem. But crushing; no. Too brutal." You get – you get the whole thing The pc will have the level all right, but the intensity of it is wrong.

I'll give you an idea. We get "dislike." And for some reason or other, "dislike" falls out of the hamper. And we try to run "dislike." We never clear it with the pc or ask him what the intensity of the – the word is. He says, "dislike."

"Dislike a man," she – this girl says. "Dislike a man. Well, yes, I suppose so. Dislike a man."

"How would dislikes" – and you ask them, "How would dislikes solve a problem about a man?"

"How would dislikes solve a problem about a man? Hate. Hate. Hate. Yeah, oh, yeah. Hate. Ha-hah, yeah."

Just put the two side by side. "Dislike," "Hate." "Dislike" promptly disappears as a read and "hate" is right there as the Prehav read. Oh, yeah. Well now, that'll solve all the problems about the man for the pc. You get how – what I mean? Intensity? We've got "timid," "fear" and "terror." See, that's just intensity of the same thing – timidity, fear and terror.

You can clear those across sideways. You don't change the sense of the thing, you see; it's just the intensity of it. "To tap," "to slap," "to slug," "to jolly well smash his head in." You got the idea? But you wouldn't use all those words.

You'd say, "Well, to smash. Smash. Slug. Slap. Touch. Tap. Slug Tap. Slap. Slap. Slap. Slap. Slap. Slug Tap. Smash. Crush. Slap. Tap. Slap. Slap. Slap." You can't get any reaction on anything. You'll only have a reaction on "slap." There it is. "Tap," if it were in the Prehav Scale, has now become "slap." See, it's just difference of intensity and you'll find that every time the pc solves a thing, it goes off automatically.

Well, how – he thinks – any problem he thinks of, this is the automatic answer. If you've got the right intensity and it's cleared with the pc, it's actually almost a silly question, because you've had – you've told him the answer.

All you're trying to do is get him to look at the answer he used in the solving of that problem, because you're actually running out backtrack problems.

This is based entirely on this one basis. The Prehav Scale are the things the pc has used to solve problems and that is the definition of the Prehav Scale and that is why only this command series works.

You can knock problems out by taking the times the pc has solved them and racking those up or by taking the prior confusion. And after I've seen some of your skulls becoming absolutely flat and I've seen you look like frying pans through this crush, you see, of it all – now we're going to find the prior confusion and just blow it all, are we? *Heh-heh-heh.* The hell we are.

I can do it by taking a bit of the problem and dating it and a bit of the problem and dating and a bit of the problem and dating it. I can get the problem you've had and then date it and get a problem you've had and then date it and get a problem you've had and date it and gradually dissipate the mass. It can be taken apart that way. You don't know how to date. You never have been able to. Never saw such knuckleheaded dating in my life. That sounds more severe than it is. But you get all mixed up – one gets all mixed up in A.D. and B.C. and years ago and that goes into the middle of implants. So it's a pretty slippy job. If you want to learn how to date, fine. I'm not going to demand, however, that you know how to date. But you can take a Goals Problem Mass to pieces by dating.

And you say, "Tell me a problem you've had with a female. Cheers. All right. When might that have been? Do you suppose that ever had any real location in time?"

"No."

"All right. Well, was it a hundred thousand years ago? Was it a hundred million years ago? Was it a hundred billion years ago? Was it a hundred trillion years ago? and so on. Oh, all right. Well, is it less than a hundred trillion years ago? Well, is it ninety-nine trillion years ago? Was it less than fifty trillion years ago? Ah. Is it more than fifty trillion years ago? Is it less than fifty trillion years ago? Ah. Is it twenty-eight trillion years ago? Is it more than twenty-eight trillion years ago? Is it less than twenty-eight trillion years ago? Oh, it's more than twenty-eight trillion years ago. All right. Is it more than thirty million years ago? Less than thirty million years ago? More. Was it more than forty million years ago? Less than fort – trillion years ago? Was it less than forty trillion years ago? Oh, all right. It was less than forty trillion years ago? It was more than thirty trillion years ago?" Guess what? It must lie between thirty and forty trillion, mustn't it? "All right. Is it more than thirty-five trillion years ago or was it less than thirty-five trillion years ago. Oh, very good. That was less than thirty-five trillion years ago." This is dating

And you finally nail it down and nail it down and nail it down and all of a sudden it goes *splang-splang* and it gets more and more solid and the pc kind of undercuts it and maybe sticks with it and maybe it blows. But you've got a piece of the Goals Problem Mass in your hands.

You could ask somebody casually, "What – tell me the prior confusion to your Goals Problem Mass." You see? And you get a basket and pick up the pieces. Honest, if you ever

want to knock anybody's head off, why, just start ferreting in and driving home that question, you know.

You say, "Well, let's see. It was quite a long time ago. What – what – what do you suppose – how come, you suppose, you ever got in trouble between a streetcar passenger and a streetcar conductor? Now, between a passenger and a conductor – now, what do you suppose might have happened before that whole thing became a terrific mess to you? You know, I'm talking about *all* the times, all the times this ever became a mess to you. What do you suppose you were doing in life that got you in that kind of a . . . ?" *Ha-haha-ha-ha-ha.*

Honest, you'll get some somatics you never heard of before. Not even the medicos have ever heard of before. It probably could be done. Probably the pc would come up right on the other side of it. It's quite amazing. But you could certainly take bits of it and date it.

But if you don't do those two operations, one or the other of those, you've got these – this command series here of 30 November to carry you through. And it's a bitch. It's frankly a bitch. If the pc does not run into the Goals Problem Mass head-on, if the tone arm does not go up and stick, if the pc does not begin to feel mass, if the pc does not begin to feel very uncomfortable, if the pc just sits there comfortably saying, "Well, yes, I remember my childhood," and so forth.

"What are you looking at there?"

"Well, there is a big picture of our living room at home. And yes, yes, yes, and there's my first job and so forth and so on." And the tone arm goes down and goes up a little bit. And it goes down and it goes up a little bit. It goes down, it goes up a little bit. And there it is in it's nice quiet range and we're all having a wonderful time.

Something is wrong. Now, if that condition exists, it's simply the wrong terminal, that's all. *Bang!* It's just the wrong terminal. It's not even that you've got the opposition terminal or anything like that. It's just the wrong terminal. You just run some kind of a lock on the actual terminal, that's all.

All right. Another condition: The thing goes up, sticks up and the devil himself couldn't get it down and the pc is sitting back here and feels like he's about to be driven through the wall, and doesn't feel any mass where he is. The mass seems to be out there someplace, but isn't quite where he is and it all seems sort of difficult. The possibility is you have the opposition terminal and you were running the opposition terminal as the pc's terminal.

Now, the other factor is the pc is sitting there and the pc is getting popeyed, because you push anybody hard enough in the chest or push – take a battering ram and put it against their stomach and then lean on it hard, their eyes kind of get popped, you know. The eyes will pop out eventually. Even a frog's eyes will and they get more and more solid and everything is

getting more and more solid. And they're interested, but they're a little bit suspicious of the auditor and they're suspicious of what's happening and suspicious of the case and they're waiting to see something But it's just getting all black and mucky and it's all kind of dirty *nyaaaah* out there and there's nothing much anyhow going on. It's all just difficult somehow and the somatics are against their back or against their forehead or in their noses or they've got headaches and they're aware of an increasing mass which is very uncomfortable and they don't like it. You're right. You're right. Beware, beware, beware, if the pc throughout all the sessions never says to you sort of bravely, "Well, I guess we'll get through it somehow." If a pc never says that to you, there's something wrong.

Now, that's the least that would happen. A more average happening is, "Oh, my God, we're not going to run that again, are we? Well, we're not – that's pretty - . Well, all right, I'm - I'm game for it. *Huh-huh-huh-huh,* I'm game - go ahead. Well have the session. Will you tell me where the tone arm goes?"

"All right. Okay."

"You know, all these somatics I'm getting are all brand-new. I mean, I've never had these somatics before."

"Well, all right. Okay, well here it is." And you see a sort of a grim gritting of the teeth on the part of the pc. It's just as though he's going to have a dental operation of magnitude or something of the sort, and you utter the first command.

The weird part of it is if you've got it all right, the pc will work at it till hell freezes over and actually will – will be happier to overrun it usually, than to underrun it. The pc will keep on running it. It's a sort of a masochistic sort of an attitude. It's like the fellow – the fellow cutting his fingers off, one slice at a time, you know.

So don't expect that what we expect out of a 3D run is the pc sits there and every command looks brighter and cheerful and the E-Meter frees up and he's just getting cleaner and clearer and the needle is floating better and better and everything is all looking better in a gradient scale, from the first moment you start it till the end. You see, you've been – you've led the pc to expect something better than he is now getting.

The pc felt wonderful when you first got his first item. And then he felt awfully good when you got his second item and he was very nice and happy about the third item and then you got his modifier and he didn't feel so good. But that's all right. Somehow or another he'd certainly like to find his terminal. That will explain a great deal to him. So he finds his terminal and well that's him all right. That's good. He feels very happy about that in a sort of a head-in-the-wine-press sort of way.

But, it's all fine, you see. He knows this is all right, and it's just because it's – it's because he didn't take any aspirin. Because he's being audited, of course, he didn't want any

aspirin. And it's all right. It'll work out. Everything is fine. And then you assess the first run in the Prehav Scale and the pc is all full of hope and looking very alert. And then you start this, and the pc feels good; these things kind of run off all automatically and everything goes along fine. It's very easy to think of these problems for some reason or other. Maybe he gets even a picture, too – several pictures as a matter of fact. He gets a lot of pictures – things he never thought of before. Never had that particular reality. Gets a lot of cognitions. The pictures – they're kind of gray. They're kind of foggy, the pictures are. They're not very good, but that's all right. They'll improve, won't they?

So the pictures get worse and worse. And his headache gets worse and worse. And the pressure against his backbone gets worse and worse. And it gets harder and harder to answer the auditing command. And the auditor continues to insist that he do it again.

Zhuhh. And he comes out of session and falls against one side of the door and then the other side of the door and falls on the other side of the hall and then sits down and then sits up again and holds an E-Meter and tries to sit up in a chair, and tries to see through his eyes, but somehow or other they aren't in his head. And then he runs the next one and the next level and the next level and the next level and the next level. And it's just horrible and it's all awful and everything is ghastly. And he knows it's getting somewhere and he has faith in Ron. And it's getting pretty grim and it's pretty horrible and then he finally gets up and so forth. And he said, "Well, thank God, we're through 'withdraw,' 'hate,' 'clam up'. " We're through these various levels on this thing; we're all set.

And then one day he sits down in the chair and the auditor says, "All right, now we're going to run this level – 'hate,' 'withdraw' and 'clam up'."

"I got through all that. I got through all that once. There's no reason to go over it again, is there really?"

"No, no, no reason at all. Well, here's the first command." And he runs all the levels again. Because you can run these levels over and over. And if you've run about a dozen levels – here's another tip – if you've run about a dozen levels, and the tone arm has never come down, just go back to the first level you ever ran and just run it all over again, because there's been something left on the levels, but by running them, has freed up. You can rerun levels about three times as long as you keep their exact sequence. About the fourth time, this begins to get stupid.

You run them each one to a stuck tone arm, you can run them quite thoroughly. But it isn't really necessary to scrub them out utterly, with a wire brush across the pc's nose. For – because frankly, you can always go back and run the run again.

A good test is, is after the pc's tone arm has come down, you ask the pc – you just say this phrase to the pc and you don't get any reaction. You know, just this same Prehav level question that you would have asked in the first place – you just say that to get it originally.

You just say that to the pc and you don't get a needle reaction, you're all set. You can leave it like mad.

But if the needle sticks, then you can start expecting some trouble on a later level. When a level isn't well cleaned up, your later levels hang up. But that doesn't mean you can't go over and over levels. You can indifferently flatten, as long as you run them an hour or so or half an hour or hour – run them to a good stuck arm – you could flatten a dozen levels, to a good stuck arm that's only stuck for about five, three – well, it's stuck for five or six commands. Still needle, still arm. You could pass that up and go on to your next level. And then pass the next one up and go on to your – and do the same way and then do the same way, and do the same way. Reassess and do your next one. Reassess and do your next one. Reassess and do your next one.

Keep them. Keep them to hand, because if you're auditing that way, sooner or later you're going to have to go back to the first one and run the *whole* gamut again to get the arm blown down.

But you will notice, that if a pc is getting better on the run, the arm sticks less longly at the top of the stuck. Sticks less longly. It finally gets to the point where all the pc has to do is kind of take his attention off the session and wonder if it's raining or something outside and you've got a Clear read. See? It finally gets that bad. But you approach that by gradients.

You take a break. The pc's tone arm early, early, early in the runs is sitting at 4.75 and you give the pc a moment's break and so forth. And you come back and it's sitting at 4.75. Well, a few runs later, of Prehav levels on the same terminal on this particular commands – these are not true of earlier commands; it's only true of this set – and up it goes. It goes up fairly rapidly and sticks. And then you have a break and the pc walks up and down the hall or something like that. And you come back in and the pc is reading much lower. And then you keep running it and it goes on up again.

And then that finally approaches a point where the pc is running it and it goes up and boy, does it stick. *Thud!* It just sticks very nicely and then the pc wonders what's happening outside, you see. And it goes down to Clear read with a wildly loose needle. And then you utter the command a few more times and it goes *dzzu-dzzu-dzzu-zup* and you'll get a tight, tight motion and the arm is tight and everything is stuck and the pc's stuck, and it's irrevocable and he'll never get out of this mass again – which is more or less the keynote of it.

The auditor is sitting there saying, "God, will I ever get him through this?" And it's a good thing to say. It's better to say the auditing command, though. And the needle's stuck, the E-Meter's stuck, everything is stuck. It's all in sticky plaster and glue and the pc wonders if he hears any birds singing, he listens for a second and the needle is totally flop.

He thinks of the terminal, it's totally stuck and then it's totally flop. And then the next thing you know, he – not necessarily on just this one run or just this one terminal – but this

kind of a repetition of affairs keeps happening and after a while you can't find him on the meter. And the way that "can't find him on the meter" begins is the tone arm rises and sticks and *won't* come down; to the tone arm rises and sticks and is down the next day; to the tone arm rises and sticks but during the session break comes down and then it goes back up; to every time the pc shifts his attention slightly on something else, the tone arm comes down; to the tone arm won't stick up; to the tone arm won't read, won't – needle won't read, nothing will read.   Kick the pc in the shins and try to get the meter to work. Won't work. Only that Clear won't slump. Why? You've handled the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, the reason why you're charging head-on into it this way, is you're solving the case for once and for all and you're not adding up to a slump situation. You're trying to clear it up on all dynamics and it works out.

It's pretty remarkable. The pc stays terribly interested, maybe for the first two, three, four days in their terminal. They stay very interested in this situation. It's very, very interesting, but of course the terminal then comes down to what? "Failed boredom" or something, you see. And they're not interested in their terminal. They don't want to hear about it. And if you ever listen much to the pc on how they feel about it and what they want to run, you'll lay an egg every time. You have to make up your mind independent of that, because they're an incompetent judge of what should be done with their case.

In running 3D remember this – that the pc is *always* an incompetent judge of what should be done with his case. He is caught in between two sets of bumpers and bulldozers and he can't quite make it out. Well, it's liable to be this or it's liable to be that. And he says the terminal – and this is – but you can listen to him, maybe something on his opinions about this and that. That's fine. Always listen to the pc anyhow. But don't let it swerve your judgment. But you – he says, "I'm no longer interested in it and I think it is flat."

Well, now that's the way you put the pennies on a dead man's eyes. It's not flat. The pc – the oldest mechanism known in Dianetics has moved into existence. The engram has moved up to boredom; the pc has come up to boredom. In this particular case, the terminal usually has come down to boredom and it decides it doesn't want to be run anymore.

Well now, there's the behavior of this, and there's the patch-up of this. Now, I called in all these papers – and Mike will have to take them back up again afterwards, but I'm just showing you here – here's a stack of case histories. It's very, very interesting that out of this tremendous number of case histories that you see lying here in front of you, that there are only, I think at the outside – maybe when the final roundup is through, there will have been five errors in terminal – just five in this whole number of people. That's pretty good. That's pretty good. But that's with me on the job, see? So it's five errors in 3 – Routine 3 assessments, you understand? Just five, on things I was watching very closely and ready to

catch them if they fell through, don't you see? And I myself am not checking these things out. I'm not following them all the way through on their runs and so forth.

Nevertheless, that is five out of twenty-five or one-fifth, as a close figure. One-fifth error? Pretty good, huh? And that's why we abandoned Routine 3. Because we could have a one-fifth error. One case out of five would be improperly assessed and mowed down like mad. There's no cross-check on it. There is no check of any kind on Routine 3. That's why we have stopped running Routine 3.

And that's why we're running 3D. Because 3D can be cross-checked, it can be reoriented, it can be put back together again, it makes sense, it polices itself, you can always fix it up if it goes bad. You're going to be in a position of having to patch these things up; remember that you can find any part of 3D if you know exactly what one part is. If you can just establish one part accurately as to what it exactly is, you can find the remaining parts.

So 3D – we're not making this many errors with 3D. Right at this present moment, I've got it a 100 percent on the road. No mistakes on 3D, because I'm not permitting mistakes to be run because they're observable mistakes. You get the idea? So even with me on the job with Routine 3, you could fall on your head all over the place.

All right. You've got to get up with Routine 3D so with me *not* on the job where you'll be auditing, you'll never fall on your head. But I'm telling you that it is easy to do. And you yourself will be able to see that it is easy to do.