3D PACKAGES

A lecture given on
19 December 1961

Hi today.

Audience: Hi.

Is there anybody alive?

Audience: Yes.

Okay. What's the date?

Audience: December 19.

Nineteenth Dec. Christmas is on its way. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course '61.

Now, there are many vagaries and upsets which you are going through in pursuing your course through the knothole. The course known as from normal up through mere being in hell . . . I think Dantes wrote a book sometime or another – a comic book I think it was – and he wrote this thing, and apparently they came up through seven levels, and processing wasn't so good in those days. And the levels that we're going through – from normal up to merely being in agony – have to do with, well, first hearing about Scientology. That's, you might say, a step. And that's quite an adventure to some people. After they read the RC's accounts of Scientology in Australia or the psychiatrists' ravenings over TV on the subject, and so forth. That is a tough one. And that is the period of "Does it exist or doesn't it exist? Is it true, is it not true? Is it a fraud, isn't it a fraud? What is all this entheta I hear? Is there any facts through it?"

Now, factually, for some people, this period – because it matches up with their oppterm and their terminal so nicely, you see – I mean, you got messy collision with these things – this period isn't over until really they hit the Goals Problem Mass with a thud. They're still wobbling, you know. They're still wobbling Some raving maniac comes along, you know, with his hair standing on end, you know, still with the electrodes from the insane asylum, you know, trailing out behind him, wearing some weskit. In other words, an authority. And he says, "Hubbard is wrong! *Ha-ha-ha-ha."*   And they say, "Well, maybe he is. Maybe he is."

You know, this horrible thought strikes the person, you know? And "This is all a fraud!" you see, and "Maybe it is," you know. And then you read in the newspapers how we have just overthrown the North Pole or some other ridiculous statement, you see?

And then the next co-audit session or something, you get a little somatic, you know.

Somebody says, "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting," you know, or something like that. Something goes *tst*, you know. It's the somatic one's had for some time, you know.

And all of a sudden one remembers some small period of one's life. You know, yesterday, something like that. And this is such a startling reality and is a reality of such magnitude that our next and immediate step, of course, is to say, "It's true! It's true! It's true!" You see? Until one hits the next "maybe" in the case, you see?

And all of this is all part of going Clear. Let's just accept it as a fact. As you see people around Central Organizations, PE Courses and your private practice and so forth, just accept it as the fact that they're going to wobble on and off and on and off. There's a great wide plain. They don't know there's any road across it at all.

Of course, it's all marked out. It's got verge, and it's got center lines, and there are lights and traffic signs on it. But they walk along, and they walk straight over the road, and they wonder if there's anything there, you know. And they get off on the plain on the other side, and they don't know if anything is there, and so on.

Well, that's basically because they're searching for themselves. They're not searching for Scientology. Look, they wouldn't stay around that long if they were really doubtful. That's what's interesting, you know. The doubt is mostly verbal.

It's in only a minor percentage expressed physically. Somebody usually succumbs when his family have decided long ago – their oppterm, you see, is a boy or something like that – and they decided long, long, long time ago, you see, that he should go the road, their road. You know, the rougher, the better; and the crazier, the more satisfactory.

In other words, they run a "make fail" on him of great magnitude, you know? And they've always been doing this, and he collides with that one time too often and actually knocks off and doesn't get processed again or something like that.

You can see people disrail this way, but it takes a considerable amount of force and duress to derail them. And all the ravenings of the RC and their companions the communists, and other people of this character deter them not at all, really. Some of the biggest upsurges some Central Organizations have ever had is immediately after one of these blasts, you know. And the favorite red rag comes out and says, "The E-Meter is a pile of junk." The subhead of the title should be "Boy! Do we have withholds!"

And this comes out with a crash, and sometimes it has an adverse effect. Sometimes it has no effect. *Time* magazine – I wrote them one time, just to give them an estimate of how well they were read and believed, that as far as I could tell on reviewing Central Organization figures of preclears and students and mail, that not one blast in *Time* magazine had ever

affected the Central Organizations of Scientology, plus or minus, by as much as one letter. I thought I'd give them a win.

They never answered the letter, you know. They usually do, but they never answered that one. And once here in London somebody came on ITV.

For some years, we have pursued this program. Every time we hear it's going to be shown someplace in the world, we clobber the station and tell them we're going to have thousands of people in their area turn off their sets, and they always buy this and never show it – if we hear of it coming on.

And some psychoanalyst went nattering around one way or the other on the thing – and it was momentarily destructive; for one week nobody walked into the London front door – and then it all came back again. I think you had something to do with that. I mean – and it was all supposed to be in the best of all possible guises, you see. I mean, that was good publicity and it recoiled. Relatively speaking, it was good publicity. But nobody walked in the front door for a week.

But a recent blast at the – in Australia, the recent blasts are so important that students all over the campus – their university paper having published a blast on Scientology – are phoning the Central Organization apologizing for their newspaper. And the person who wrote the article, or one of the people who helped write the article, has been in and signed a full confession voluntarily, and so forth. So that was getting no place.

But their PE has been full to the rafters ever since the stuff appeared. So it doesn't have too much to do with it. You start worrying when there isn't any comment anyplace. That's when you should start worrying, see. Think of the number of philosophies and ideas and thoughts. Think of the number of wild Indians that have come out of India and sat cross-legged in the middle of Times Square in the last eleven years, and we don't know any of them.

You know, we never heard of any of them. Nobody's cussing them out. Nobody's mad at them. They're not getting anyplace, either. One of the penalties of popularity is dodging bullets. And one of the penalties of advancing truth into this aberrated society is dodging avalanches. They'll throw brickbats, pots, pans, and everything else at you because everybody who has a pitch and a curve sees at once his vested interests threatened.

What would happen, for instance, in all hospitals if the public suddenly, en masse, demanded effective medical treatment in every case. Think what would happen. Oh, man! They'd have to sack every medico in the joint. Because they can't deliver.

And so, of course, when we come along with a philosophy of saying everybody should be helped, *ooooho,* we're advancing a very hostile philosophy. Very hostile. Because their philosophy is "If we can have an out, we're all right," you see. And one of the reasons we're advancing is we left ourselves no out.

So remember, it's this kind of a society in which the person who first hears of Scientology and goes through his first stages of processing lives in. It's this kind of a society. He's surrounded by people with a vested interest in keeping him crazy, in making a fool out of him, and so forth. He's surrounded by these people.

He also has been many times defrauded. He has parted with money – "Hypnotize yourself and become popular overnight: grow green hair," you know? Or anything like this. So he doesn't know.

Well, don't expect him to know very fast because after the environmental upset goes out, then his own immediate invalidation – which is his Goals Problem Mass – starts going in and out, in and out, and it monitors, to a large degree, his attitude. And his attitude is very definitely monitored by this. I'm going to tell you some more about this. It's quite interesting to you technologically how it does monitor.

But anyway, there might be a long period of this, wishy-washy, "Maybe it's here, maybe it's there, maybe it isn't, maybe it is true, maybe it isn't true. I hope it isn't true, I hope it is true." This might go on for a quite a long period of time before somebody seriously sat down and began the fateful seventy-five hours of Security Checking, Problems Intensives, and things of that character which will lead up to an assessment.

Now, during that period, he wishes to God he had never heard of Scientology. That's one of his frequent reactions. He says, "Well, I just won't be able to tell the auditor in the morning."

He's forgotten this withhold. He's forgotten it utterly. It had never preyed on his mind. All of a sudden the thing has leaped into view, and there he sits with it. Half an hour after the last Sec Checking question, he has suddenly remembered it. It's going to be something on the order of maybe fifteen to twenty hours before his next session.

During those fifteen or twenty hours, of course, he goes through numerous cycles of, "Well, I'll just . . . I'll just sit down and I'll just own up, just like that." And then he says, "Oh, but I don't know. I don't know."

And there's the question, of course, of what will the auditor do with this. Yes, and other people will hear about it, and so forth. Well, of course, I could answer this from my viewpoint.

I have ceased to worry about anybody talking about my withholds. You know why? Lots of people invent so many withholds for me that I have. . . It's very remarkable, you know. I'm the best-supplied person with withholds you ever heard of. If they only knew what my actual withholds were, their hair would stand on end, probably. But it's almost pointless my trying to tell anybody my withholds.

And we used to notice this in the old days, way back, six, seven years ago. Somebody'd come in and he'd sit down with the D of P – "I see in the Auditor's Code it says that the pc's secrets and so forth... Are you sure you're not going to . . . Because I don't want anybody to learn about my flat feet." Time after time, you know.

And just in the course of old-time Class I-type processing, day after day, being chewed at one way or the other by this idea or that idea or this mass or that mass, something of the sort, whatever it was. And after a week, two weeks, something like that, the same pc comes in, she sits down, and she says, "Well, my flat feet are certainly hurting these days, you know!" She can be heard out in the hall and upstairs and everyplace else, and she couldn't care less. It's a very remarkable change that they used to experience.

That was my first noticing of this phenomena. Whenever we did have them supersecret, if we were doing a good job of processing them at all, why, they would wind up in a few weeks, they didn't – couldn't care less.

Now, of course, that period is passed during this seventy-five hour preparatory period. Now, I'm saying seventy-five hours just to give you a unit of time. I don't mean seventy-five hours. Two hundred. Five hundred. Fifty. It depends to such a tremendous degree upon the expertness of the auditor and it depends to an enormous degree upon the depth of curve of the pc.

And remember, you are sec checking up against a Goals Problem package. You've got that package. And if that package has a holder of secrets versus a person who punishes people with secrets, everything that you say to the pc is to some slight degree being interpreted as coming from the punisher of secrets while the pc sits there and flips easily into the valence of the holder of secrets, you see.

So you're going upstairs against this package, anyway. And that could make a long haul. That could make a long haul out of this.

The expertness of the auditor is another factor. An auditor who says, "All right. Now, what have you – what have you – what you have done, here, is the question here, I guess. Print's rather small; can't see very well. Let me get some light on the E-Meter. I don't know if these – this instrument really works. Uh – uh – uh . . . Let's see now. What – what's the question here? Have you ever – well, have you ever picked any cherries? Yes, have you ever picked any cherries? Well, have you ever picked . . . It says right – right here. I'm not asking you – it says here, so uh... Have you ever picked any cherries? It says," and so forth.

And the pc says, "Well, I knew somebody one time that picked some cherries, and so on."

And the auditor says, "Well, that's good. Thank God that question is clear. Now, let's go on to the next one."

That's going to take a long time. Because part of the long time it's going to take is the number of times the person has had withholds missed on him, has blown, and then has had to get ahold of himself by the collar and bring himself back in and decide that or some other auditor can continue to sec check him. You get the idea?

And he has to face up to it. And do you know that there could be a period of ten years intervening in that seventy-five hours? And I've already seen several years on some cases intervening. You know, they just disappear and go over the hills. And next thing you know they turn up again and say – sit down rather – with a desperate look in their eye. And that time they don't stay either. They disappear again.

And this kind of fluctuation all gets into that seventy-five hours, so it's not a little thing.

All right. They get up to the Goals Problem Mass. Now, how long is it going to take to get a Goals Problem Mass? At the moment that they get all of the elements, they're in better shape than they have ever been in. They're in better shape they've ever been in at the time they get all the elements.

When they got their first level and it's half run, or their second level, and it's all run, they're in worse shape than they have ever been in. It goes from the sublime to the ridiculous. That's such a rolly coaster, up-and-down dive on the pc that it's quite remarkable.

And if he's unlucky enough to have these, his oppterm and his term, of fair equality, that they are not too great a difference in them so that you can't differentiate too well between these two things and you have to run it experimentally to see if you turn on somatics, and that sort of thing, or if you do something of this character or you test it out by processing... You shouldn't have to do this, but frankly in some cases there's no other way. And you test it out by processing, and you run him on a level just to find out what level he's going to come up with and what's going to turn on, of course, he feels horrible if it's the wrong side. He just feels terrible. It doesn't kill him. So what?

But he sure feels bad. And that'll make him feel even worse than running the right side. And he goes on up the line and I would say his first fifteen levels are the hardest. First fifteen levels are the hardest, and then they begin to bite. He doesn't mind, however, when they are biting. It's when he is fighting the shadows that he doesn't like it.

And where he goes from there and how long it takes him to come up at the other end again has a lot to do . . . Is he run on these levels? Is he run on these levels with the rudiments in or the rudiments out? That's important because that tells you how long

How many times is he going to have to retrace these levels? Because you don't run them just once. You get up to a certain number of levels like a dozen or something like this, and sometimes if a case is not progressing too well, six, something like that.

And then you'd assess the levels again. You don't do a new Prehav Assessment. You go over the run levels and find out if any of them still tick. And if that one still ticks, you rerun and flatten that process, and you'll find that button has come up again. So you can continue this rerun process as you run the levels forward by Prehav Scale, you also rerun levels. And you'll every once in a while find that your pc is feeling kind of goofy because the level – that two levels ago – has come alive by virtue of having run the one you had just run.

It wasn't that it wasn't flat when you ran it. You did. You ran it to a flat point, but now you've run its complementary level, and you've opened it wide up. And there it is.

It won't assess, particularly, if you go down the Prehav Scale, because it's too weak, but it's still run. And now you have a pc running on one level while another level is alive. And that is what makes a pc feel spinny. Nothing else in 3D makes a pc feel spinny but running on one level while another level which has been run is alive. That's what makes him feel spinny.

He – "No." He wonders if you got the right button. "Is – is – is it the right.. . Well, I don't know. Isn't there a button on the Prehav Scale called apprehension?" You know, something like this. "Uh. . . terror maybe. Maybe it's terror. Maybe – maybe the auditor's got the wrong button." Well, it's not "apprehension" or "terror." It's "withdraw" and "communicate" are both alive, and the two between them make, of course, a sort of insanity ridge. And one has come alive after it's been run, and so you've got buttons in that shape. So that particular thing we can take care of. The rest we don't care to take care of except straight on forward.

Pc starts to feel spinny. In a 3D run, you simply reassess. You don't assess for a new level. You reassess the existing levels and find out which one – any one of them, then, that needle reacts at all, you rerun in sequence. That's the rule.

You don't assess them out for the one that reacts the most. You take them in sequence every time. You go back over and you find out the third level you ran is now getting a stick. So you rerun that level to a stuck. And you find out that the fifth level you ran gets a little, tiny theta bop. Sporadic theta bop. Now it bops, now it doesn't bop, now it bops, now it doesn't bop – something like that, you see. You rerun that level, and then you come back up and follow them all the way through. Every needle reaction, you flatten the level, and then reassess on the Prehav Scale and continue your run. And all of a sudden it goes much more smoothly.

You eventually get up to the point, regardless of how many levels have been run or how often they have been rerun, or something of this sort, you get up to this point of the thing goes up to stick, but the pc wiggles his nose, and it goes down to Clear read. And then eventually you can't make it stick anymore. Then it just won't go up and stick. It'll just go down to Clear. And from there on it goes out to a float.

Now, there are various ways to accelerate this, and I'm working on some of those accelerative methods, and you are dropping out Security Checking, of course, during a 3D run which is in violation of the basic design of packages, see. Your pc should be getting security checked. But the only Security Checks that will do the pc any good of any kind, whatsoever, of course, are on the terminal and the oppterm.

I was clever enough the other day to dream up a process, of all things, which security checked the terminal and oppterm and the pc, and I'll release that to you. That's an interesting round of roodles. That's basic – it's a – you remember the old mutual motion process which I gave you much earlier?

Well, it's "What's the mutual motion of the terminal" and "What have you done the terminal wouldn't like," and mutual motion of the oppterms. Oppterms, terminals, see? "What is the mutual motion of the oppterms. Well, what about that motion? What have you done that they wouldn't like," you know?

What you're doing is kicking together their moral code. And then, "What's the mutual motion of the oppterm and the term?" And "What have you done that they wouldn't like?" And then "What is the mutual motion of you and others?" And "What wouldn't the terminal like about that?" And "What wouldn't the oppterm like about that?"

And that is your formula. That's the extent of the formula. Of course, it goes round and round, and it's all balanced into flows, and it runs off the exact moral codes of the term, the oppterm, and you. Don't you see? So it gives you in essence a Security Check.

This is under test right now, and I don't know quite whether to run it in every other level that is run or every two levels that is run or in a special period, or something like that. I'll have some more data on that and release it very shortly.

But anyway, that gives you a Security Checking boost which should run the run faster. And anyhow, you would have to run it before the person was released off of the thing because it would take all the remaining bits and pieces of the 3D – original 3D package and blow it up on a Goals Problem Mass. It's quite fascinating.

There are a number of these little boosters, by the way. One of them – perhaps you haven't quite understood this. That your Problem Solving Survey – which is what you might as well call this thing, I've had to write it on so many reports that I eventually had to get a name for it to tell the auditor to do it – a Problems Solved Survey is simply "How would you solve problems? How would terminals solve problems? How would oppterms solve problems?" And did you realize that if you kept going on this, and getting a list for you and a list for the term, and a list for the oppterm, and a list for you, and a list for the term, and a list for the oppterm, and a list for you, you realize that if you just went around as though it were a process, you would be running a tremendous differentiation on these three items, and the pc is never really run on this. And I think you will bear me out in this.

A pc can't have any kind of . . . Well, he finds ten or fifteen ways to solve problems that "you" would solve problems, ten or fifteen ways that the oppterm would solve problems, ten or fifteen ways that the terminal would solve problems. And you come up at the other end having had one of these run on you with a better idea of the differentness of these three things.

And I think you've already experienced that. Well, you keep that going for a little while, they just tend to shred apart. Because what essentially does an E-Meter register? An E-Meter registers disagreement. And what are these but disagreements? It shows the basic disagreement between "you" and the terminal, and "you" and the oppterm, and the oppterm with the term. And it shows these disagreements. It shows wherein they disagree. And that the disagreements are very large, you develop a mass. So if you take anything as massive as the Goals Problem Mass, you will, of course, wind up with a disagreement as the basis of it, see?

Now, you also ask what goal do they have in common. Here's another one of these stunts. "What goal do – does 'you' and the terminal have in common? What goal do you and the oppterm have in common?" What – and you've only run it so far. "What goal does the terminal and the oppterm have in common," see? Or "What goal or goals do they have in common?"

When you run this for a little while, you're liable to throw the package. The package – all of a sudden the pc's attention goes over for the next couple of levels you run almost totally on the oppterm. Or it comes back very harshly on the terminal. But it dislocates the status quo. It shakes up the mass, in other words. It gets some more differentiation going and some recognition of what the mass is all about.

These are two stunts by which that can be done. The Problem Solving Survey and the goals in common. Now, you also have actions in common, and so forth. And you have this other one, which is much more important than those as a process which gives you these various overts, really overts and withholds from the mores, the exact mores of it.

This is a great gift to you as an auditor because if you were to sit down, you'd take the pc's terminal – you just never happened to have been acquainted with a snail – some reason or other, snails have gone one way and you've gone another. And the pc has an oppterm of a snail. And you going to dream up all out of your wits all of the overts a snail would think he was capable of in order to put together a Security Check. You're not going to do it, that's all. Because those things which you would think a snail would consider overts are very often quite the reverse. Because you're dealing in a sphere which is very difficult to deal in, which is to say, the exact ideas of the other fellow's terminal.

Now, we can form our ideas of the other fellow's terminal, but they wouldn't be close enough for a Security Check because the things wrong with terminals is – is they're so different. That's what's wrong with them. They are out of agreement with everything under the sun, moon and stars and have been for trillennia. They have been ages, countless ages, these

things have been wildly out of agreement. How else do you suppose they'd ever hang up in a thing called a Goals Problem Mass? They must have been a – at a disagreement that whole length of time, so how much understanding of these particular items do you think there has been?

Well, there hasn't been any understanding of them. And now we say to the auditor, "Now, just go ahead and understand a snail and dream up an entirety of the mores of a snail in view of the fact that it's your pc's, not your terminal."

Now, the pc could take a stab at it but would inevitably and invariably miss all of the real overts and all of the real withholds because he would not be able to confront any real part of, except on a gradient, the mores of a snail. Because if it's his terminal or his oppterm, well, I'll tell you, it's there and stuck because he has *always* violated his mores.

That's why you say somebody who has a terminal as "a wife" is very often a lousy wife. Somebody who's got a terminal of "bus driver" is usually a lousy bus driver, if they are ever luckless enough in life to come along as their terminal. You know, the wheels of time go around – roulette, roulette, roulette, roulette – and one fine day the ball drops in the slot which accidentally happens to be the pc's terminal. And he's right there, and he is it. Oh, there'd be nobody more stupid about it than he is.

He could mess it up faster than anybody you ever saw. Although he would apparently feel fine about it, he'd apparently know all the answers, and it would all feel natural. If his terminal was a ship captain, let me guarantee you he'd spend nothing but tangling himself up in hawsers and getting drowned. He would be able to tell you all about ship captaining, and he'd talk a good ship captain, and he'd look like a good ship captain, and he'd act like a ship captain, but he'd just keep getting drowned.

Now, in view of the fact that the thetan steers himself in toward the oppterm every time, and the terminal whenever he can make it, we see what kind of a life he has been leading these last many trillennia. It's been a mess. Because there he was always trying to be the one thing he was in total disagreement with. If he had a total disagreement with it, he was going to try to be that, that was all about there was to it.

All right. Now, as you start walking along this track, running up the line, your pc will be, of course, convinced – your early runs of the 3D package – of course, your pc will be convinced, usually, that it is the wrong terminal. If he doesn't have much of a grasp on the situation, he'll tell you it was the right one at first, and then after a few somatics have turned on, he'll decide that the other one would be much more comfortable. Unless he's got an excellent grip of exactly what he is bucking into, he will try to change your mind as an auditor. That's in a large number of cases. Large enough to be very interesting It's not 100 percent, but it's some big number.

Now, what's this all about? Well, it's just that the person is disoriented in this area, and he is the worst judge. Now, he might be a better judge of the mores of the terminal or oppterm than you are. But let me assure you, he is the *worst* judge of which is which and what it is all about and which he is. He is the worst judge.

During periods when you're reading off oppgoals and things like that to him, a great certainty of the beingness of the thing will come to him. During a period of listing and assessment, a great certainty will come to him. And maybe for a run or two a great certainty will be his lot.

And then, of course, he inevitably starts passing through all the maybes. And I don't think there's a person going to Clear alive who won't spend some time in the middle of the night, at sometime or another, wondering if that's the right package or if that is his terminal or if it is all correct, anyway.

Now, some will do it more than others, but you usually get into a lineup on this. And you as an auditor should be vividly aware of this interesting fact.

The *worst* judge in the auditing room is the pc. It is not a case of the pc knows. It's the case of the pc is something on the order of a roll going through the player piano, and that is the way it is running off. It all depends on whether the air is blowing through the roll or not, whether you get any music. Hasn't anything to do with anybody playing the piano. And you would be very stupid and very unkind and even very, very cruel if after you had determined by all seven types of reaction that this was the pc's terminal, if you then wobbled off the line and decided it wasn't.

Perfectly all right to run the other side, you see, and find out how the pc reacts on the other side, if you're not sure and you can't make up your mind. But it isn't all right for you to wobble because the pc is unhappy about it. That is the last reason you should wobble. Because he's the worse judge. Although he has been a snail for at least a hundred trillion years, although this is his most favorite game, and so forth, until you get him well run on the Prehav levels, you know, he really knows nothing about it. You could go to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and look up snails and learn more about snails than he ever could tell you any day, any day. But then all of a sudden he passes through the not-know barriers, one way or the other, and he decides to confront this thing, and then of course he becomes a great authority on snails, and the *Encyolopaedia Brittanica* hasn't anything in it about snails, that's all. It's just got nothing in it, hardly a thing And it's true; he will really know about snails.

And it's early in the run, early in the run, this knowledge may turn on flickeringly and turn off again, and on and off, on, off, on, off. And then eventually it starts coming on. It comes on very strong and stays on, and then he knows all about it. And at the time when he starts to know all about it, he more or less stops dramatizing it. He will eventually recover this fact: that the one series of skills he could not execute were those connected with his oppterm

and his term. That is one zone of skills for the term and one zone of skills for the oppterm that he is just about as expert as Charlie Chaplin trying to walk a tightrope. He is from nowhere. This he knows nothing about. He can't do them.

And he himself will not realize this. For a long time he won't realize this. He'll say, "Well, my terminal is a tightrope walker. And, I remember when I was a boy I used to fool around with tightropes, and go to circuses; always appreciated tightrope walking. I know a great deal about tightrope walking."

He'll tell you this. He'll think this. And his oppterm is a ringmaster. Well, he can always shout loudly, and he knows a lot about being a ringmaster, too. And he's got it all set. And he's sort of convinced in his own mind, you see, at this stage, you know, that he knows something about this and can do those things. A period will arrive in his processing – as you go running levels on the term and oppterm; running levels on his terminal, of course, and the oppterm coming off incidentally – when he will suddenly realize that he has never walked any tightropes for a long time. For the last million years or so maybe he's never really walked a tightrope.

Yet he thought about walking tightropes. He seems to know a lot about it. Yes, he saw tightrope acts. Yes, all these things are true, but the point is the one thing he would never do is walk a straight chalkline on a sidewalk, walk on the edge of anything, walk at any height close to falling off, you know, or walk any line that was off the ground or have anything to do with people who would do it. And that would be one huge zone of existence with which he has no communication. He only has the apparency of familiarity. Here's this tremendous zone he really knows nothing about.

And that comes on about the same time as he finds out something about it. And after this has been run for a while, of course you have your authority.

At the time he really starts talking about this, unimpressively but happily, with great authority and with considerable knowledge, will be after he has recognized that he is at odds with all of these skills and that they are locked out as far as he is concerned. Life has never really permitted him to do these things.

He's tried to do them. He's fallen off his – more tightropes and more high tents than you could easily count, but for the last – for a long time he hasn't done it at all, really.

Now, when the zone opens up, he recognizes that it was a zone of stupidity, not a zone of knowledge. Now, of course, what's interesting is, the same time this opens up to him, he stops dramatizing it and the information becomes available to him.

And that's an interesting phenomena. The information becomes available to him. After all, he did have the information. After all, he has studied it. After all, he has been it. And you

have this tremendous fund of information on this particular subject. Now, he could be it well, and you as the auditor could make a mistake at this point.

You could say, "Well, we've certainly gone on and on and on, here, just to get this fellow up to where he can dramatize because he keeps talking about tightrope walking." No, the guy's now interested in tightrope walking. Never really was before. You've got a tremendous zone of data which has been opened to the pc that was never opened to him before, and of course he's liable to err all – a lot of this data and so on. It sounds like he now has really sunk solidly into the valence, to the auditor, see.

My God, this fellow comes walking in, he walks down the hall on a crack on the edge of the rug, don't you see, and he says, well, it's just to show himself that he could. He feels pretty good about it, you know. And he walks in, and you'll notice him balancing before the session. He balances his chair on its two back legs, you know, and so on. And he does interesting things.

And he'll give you all kinds of data about Japanese tightrope walking. How, that's not quite the thing. You know, that's not quite right because they use these balance poles, and they're leaded in the ends, and that's just cheat, you see. See? Because who could fall off a tightrope with a long balance pole with lead in both ends of it, you see. He'd be very authoritative on the subject.

You make your mistake. When the information opens up to the pc, it is not information he is longer going to dramatize. The more he knows about it, the less he dramatizes it, the more he can do it. And you will see all that unfold before your eyes.

But he will actually enter. . . And it looks like he's introducing some of these things into his life. And you say, "Well, he's really sunk now."

No, only thing he's doing, he's making up for the absence of them. He can accept these things along with the other things which he already has had. And it's sort of a beautiful feeling of freedom to him to be able to string up a tightrope in the backyard.

"Hey, what do you know? *Ha-Ha-Ha.* I can string up a tightrope. Pretty good, you know."

You'd say, "Boy, this guy's gone around the bend. There he is stringing up tightropes. We found this terminal, "tightrope walk." We run it for fifteen levels, and here he is stringing up tightropes, and be breaking his neck and enrolling in a circus next." No, he won't. He will neither break his neck nor will he enroll in a circus, but he's liable to put up a tightrope just to show that he can confront it, you know? Because it's such a pleased, wonderful feeling, you know.

Or let's say his terminal was a goldfish, and you're liable to find him down at the aquarium. Going down to the aquarium and saying, "Gee, you know. Gosh, you know. Look, I can confront the little bastards."

You know, anything like that. But what he does is express relief, and the return of information is actually return of zone of activity, return of an enormous zone of activity. And he has been barred out of it for trillennia, and he has never been happy in it.

And it's a great feeling of relief to be able to get into communication with it. Well, the case is three-quarters cracked when that occurs. You want to know how fast somebody is going Clear, well, there is that exact point on any line.

Now as you move up further – it's mostly needle phenomena – but you'll find out that the pc's intelligence, his ability to inspect and grasp . . . I don't care what it reads on IQ sheets. I just couldn't care less because an IQ sheet is actually too limited to tell you, really, what the increase of IQ is. His ability to perceive, absorb, and apply information is enormously increased.

You'll see this constant and continuous increase from there on out. That's your next noticeable phenomena. He'll take up studies of some kind or another. He'll start studying something, and he'll come up with conclusions that nobody's ever concluded before. Things of this sort. He'll have a better grasp of the immediate situation. And he starts to get busy, he starts to get busier.

And you'll have trouble keeping the rudiments in all through this period that I'm talking to you about because he confronts the zone with beautiful freedom, you see, and runs into something he shouldn't – thinks he shouldn't be confronting, and he doesn't know whether he should or shouldn't. He's falling off of the wagon. He's getting back on the wagon again. He's trying to adjust himself in life and trust himself in the environment in which he lives all through this period.

So the rudiments are, if anything, harder to keep in late in a run. But you won't notice that they're harder to keep in sometimes because they can be knocked in so easily. You get so that you can put the rudiments in more easily and you don't realize how wildly they are going out.

So don't develop any contempt for rudiments toward the end of a run. They have to be put in much more frequently, much more often and much harder. They go out so easily. The person's colliding with life, it looks strange, and it looks different to him, and he is an impact. Not so much here, but if you were clearing somebody in Pretoria, you might find yourself in – well, he's in collision with the society. And society doesn't much like what's happening to him. You know, there'd be a member or two around invalidating him or something of this sort.

It's always a good idea to get possibly – you see, the personnel around the pc doesn't even have to be invalidating the pc for the auditor to take action on it. You recognize that? That it is a fruitful source of upset to the pc. So fruitful and can cause an auditor so much wasted auditing time, that an auditor is actually foolish not to make some sort of an effort to get the pc temporarily and momentarily out of an un – restimulative environment while certainly running – assessing and running the Goals Problem Mass. Certainly it's a wise thing to do. And if there are possibly restimulative personnel around, even though these restimulative personnel aren't actually chopping up or doing anything much to the pc, and the pc's case is not going well or something like that, one of the measures you can take is just advise him very frankly to remove himself momentarily from such contact, you see, until he finishes his auditing

Otherwise, you'll find that toward the end of cleared run you get stalled and you won't be able to tell exactly how you're being stalled. But you're being stalled because his collision with the society, constant comments on people telling him he looks different, that he acts different. He tells them about things they never heard of before. He's in higher communication.

He says, "Well, I remember the last time I was out here, I was with the Mormon army, and we were coming out here," and his lack of caution on the thing has permitted him to say this at a dinner party, you see.

And then he's more perceptive, so at once he realizes that the hostess and three or four other people at the table have realized that he'd gone around the bend.

He doesn't invalidate himself so much, but he becomes a little upset about it. And then he begins to wonder if he could live in this society if he were really sane. And then he invalidates going Clear, and so on. And that, by the way is a good point.

Now, the next thing that you want to take up along this line is the willingness to be Clear. Now, although this might have been cleared up with the pc back during the Sec Check period, the willingness of the pc to go Clear when the first Goals Problem Mass hits the pc is probably very great because, "Good God, this much mass certainly has been doing me no good," and he gets explanations in all direction, but then he gets a secondary reaction.

He's not quite sure, and that's about all that's expressed. He's just not quite sure. And you'll get invalidations of going Clear off of him. He'll say, "Oh, I'm not quite sure."

Now, there's a bigger one follows this that is a real crasher. And it's liable to happen. And it's probably happened to some cases here, and you should look at – for this rather constantly in running the goals problem thing. Keep alert to it as a factor.

He's not sure that he wants to get rid of this game. Now, I refer you to lectures clear back in June, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, on the subject of "It's the Only Game." And

he goes through a period of its being the only game. And, of course, that is what is wrong with him, the idiot. He can't have even that as a game, so he is not in a games condition. He's technically in a games condition, yes. But his actual condition in life is a no-games condition. And he's so fixated on this game of the snail, you see, that he can't conceive of any other game. He has to start sticking his head out of his shell.

And he has arrived at a point where he is not at all sure that there are any other games, but he is perfectly sure that there is a game called being a snail.

And his new reality on this game called being a snail causes him at once to try to put on the brakes and saying, "If I lose this game, I will lose everything because where would you be if you couldn't be a snail," you know. "What if you forgot to be a snail after this? Just what would you do for a shell?"

Lots of puzzling things are stirring in the reactive bank at this time.

And you get these expressed as invalidations of going Clear. Naturally, he never sees this other more interesting point. The other more interesting point, of course, is that if he weren't so confounded fixated on being a snail, he could even be a snail. That's what's interesting He could even be a snail. He's never achieved that yet. So his unwillingness to give up a game he hasn't got is, of course, the purest of idiocy. But it's a reactive combination which a pc goes through.

You'll find almost any pc who is making good progress will hit this thing And it's so much so, that if a pc doesn't hit this at some time or another, I would start wondering if he was running the right terminal or oppterm or missing the commands, or if I was running it all with the rudiments out, or something. I would start asking questions. It would be one of my indicators as to gain. The all of a sudden feeling of "Oh, I don't know. Just think of that. No shell, you know. You know I'd be awfully unsafe not to have a shell. I don't know if I should want to go Clear or not."

And this varies on the other side of it, "Well, if I run this any further, I might become so free in it that I might actually become a snail, and wouldn't that be horrible?"

That would be the most ghastly thing he could think of during this particular period, you see? What if he did become a snail, you know? And if he takes these withholds off from becoming a snail, of course, somewhere up the track it is a wide open pit hole, you see. He's liable to just go crawling along and fall right into it unless he keeps these barriers up, unless his whole life is filled with signs saying "Hole in road," why, he won't be able to live.

But, of course, have you ever tried in one of these one-way-street cities to get anyplace? You know, you drive up the one-way street and down the one-way street and back down the one-way street, and you find yourself on the first one-way street again. And you say,

"Well, I didn't intend to be here, I wanted to be at the City Hall." So you'll ask a cop, and you say, "How do you get from here to the City Hall?"

And the cop thinks it over for a long time and thinks over all the one-way signs that are pointing between here and there, and then he eventually looks at you, and he says, "Well, you can't get from here to there."

So here's your pc living this kind of a life, you see. It's nothing but one-way-street signs and on both ends of the block you have signs pointing to the middle of the block one-way streets, see?

And if he didn't have all these, he might become a snail. So it's very important to stay in the middle of the rat race. That condition and consideration hits him rather constantly. It may hit him hard. It may hit him harder than you think.

Now, a piece of technical data is, an invalidation of a terminal or other 3D part reacts similarly to the 3D part. An invalidation may act similarly. The 3D part rock slams, the invalidation of it will rock slam, no matter how tiny the slam is.

So whatever the invalidation is, it's easy to locate because all you have to do is get some part of it reading or just remember how it read, and then ask him for people who have said things about it until you get that little rock slam. And then follow that right on down, and you'll find invalidation of the goal, invalidation of the terminal, invalidation of the oppterminal, invalidation of the modifier – find something there – or invalidation of going Clear. And all of these things will read the same as the package.

Why does it read the same as the package? Because it's activated the package. That's why. So it reads back as the package.

There are only a few things that ever read the same. The six parts of the 3D package all read the same. If you consider that the opposition terminal has its own goal in addition to the opposition goal or six parts.

They will all read the same. They will read equally plus the Prehav level. And the hot Prehav levels always read the same as the package. So all those are equal reads.

And an invalidation reads along with that package. Interesting thing for you to know if you're looking for some guy who all of a sudden has decided he doesn't want to go Clear. All you'd have to do is, "Who said that? Who didn't want that? Who has talked to you about this? What have you hit? When did you think of that?"

And all of a sudden you'll turn on the same needle reaction as the whole package gives, you see, or any item in the package gives. Follow that needle action down, and you'll have the invalidation of it right on the button. Nice thing to know.

All right. Now, with all of these ramifications and rolly coasters and bad spots, and so forth, it is odd that the pc continues to be interested at all. This is remarkable but is part of the package.

His attention is so bound up in the package that he will only get disinterested if his attention is yanked too violently off of the package during session or he is put into braces about this all.

"All right. You're a snail. Well, you can act a lot differently in life. Just look at all this life that is going on around you, and so forth, and we don't care whether you're a snail or not."

Somebody knowing about this and using it in an argument with him, something like that, yanks his attention, rather violently, off of the subject, and so forth. It's attention *off* that keeps the fellow from going Clear, not attention *on.* Attention *on* continues him on toward Clear.

All ARC breaks that you've ever had with a pc is attention *off* the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, patching up is another phase that is with us temporarily, but there are people around who have gone Clear on 3D. And there are people around who have had their goals and terminals found and who have been partially run on Routine 3. Did I say 3D a moment ago? I meant 3. Excuse me.

And it is necessary that this all be put together on a Routine 3, and I will tell you briefly how to do this.

In the first place, it is probably hard to do to get them to go ahead and get it done. That is probably hard because they feel good, they feel better, and they have had the first blush bloom of interest taken off of it all. They may, if they've gone Clear, have had the whole cotton-picking Goals Problem Mass keyed out, and it's sitting over there half a light year away. And they may not contact it for another century. But there it is, and they think this is just fine, thank you. They're just not interested in anything else happening

Of course, such a person is a liability. He's a Keyed-Out Clear.

Well, now, how do you put such a person back together again? He's been cleared on Routine 3, and we're going to clear him on 3D. What is going to happen in the process of doing this?

His first goal, you take a piece of paper . . . This is the way you do it. I'll just give it to you exactly as I would do it. You take a piece of paper, and you write down his first goal found, and you write down the first terminal found. And you write down the second goal found, and you write down the second terminal found. And you write down any other terminal or goal that was found in the process of cleaning up this case. And you write them all down on the same sheet of paper. You get the rudiments in with a crash. And then you find the

modifier to the first goal that is a likely specimen. And if the following, right after this, doesn't happen by reason of having found the modifier, then you take another goal that has been found in the clearing, and you find the modifier of it. And you find the modifiers and repeat modifiers until you've got a nice, sticky, collapsed bank.

And then you check out everything that has been run on the pc until you've got five or six pieces. And then you assemble your 3D package, and that's really all there is to it. Because, of course, the first time they found a goal on him, they probably found his goal. Who knows? The first terminal, if he went Clear, was undoubtedly his terminal. Otherwise, he wouldn't have gone Clear on it.

But the next goal found was very probably his oppgoal or something of the sort. The next terminal was possibly the oppterm, and we don't know what was found from that point on, don't you see? It got keyed out enough so that he could actually run the oppterm off at a far distance and key it out, too.

What you want to assume is, in straightening out a Routine 3 Clear, is that all parts have already been found except the modifiers. So your main task and your main difficulty is getting the needle to slow down and read any and do anything. That's your main difficulty, is getting a needle read. And you do that by finding modifiers.

And they will cheerily give you this modifier or they may not so cheerily give you this modifier. And if you haven't got any slowdown on the needle for that modifier, well, let's take the next goal or some other goal that was found on him because usually several goals were found on him and several terminals. Let's find a modifier to that goal and a modifier to the next goal and a modifier to the next goal until we just slow that thing down to mud.

Then they say, "But that beautiful needle. It was so floating clear and I felt 90 good. Damn you." You know?

And you say, "That's fine. Thank you very much. It will all come out all right in the end."

Say something platitudinous and hold him in the chair, and you've got a needle that will read again. That's your main problem is getting the needle to read. Now, you've got the thing reading, now take all the parts you've got and assemble the 3D package out of those parts. And you do that, of course, by just checking them across till you get five things that equal read, and so on. And then you find out which he was. And you do a problems solving survey as to how they would solve problems, and this one, you and the oppterm, and you eventually select out your – what would probably be your terminal, and you look for your other indicators. And then you just clank into it and run it.

Now, if you're lucky enough to have all of their records available, you also run that terminal on the first level it was ever run on, but with the commands of 7 December 61. You

rerun all the levels ever found on it, too. In fact, your work has all been done for you actually, if you know how to do it right.

Now, you do the same thing in a patch-up of a Routine 3.

This fellow has been running forever on his first goal and first terminal. Well, assume it's probably the oppterm. See, otherwise – otherwise, he wouldn't have run forever, don't you see? So just assume it was. And you'll probably be right, see? It's already been tested by run. Oh, it hadn't done him any harm.

You'll find when you get the Goals Problem Mass, it cleans up faster because it's full of Swiss cheese holes already, you see.

All right. Now, he's also conditioned into running it. Nothing can phase him now. Use that, find the other parts of the 3D package from the first part.

But let me tell you now something about the importance of the modifier. Now, the modifier isn't just found for the hell of it. You will eventually use the modifier. As a matter of fact, I've got a package of commands right now where the modifier is used as one of the commands, and so forth. It hasn't been tested out, and so on, but there are a lot of possible uses for the modifier. But this is for sure the use of the modifier.

You can accurately find your pc's terminal if you've got a modifier because it limits the number of terminals. The modifier – the presence of a modifier tends to limit the number of terminals which follow those exact specifications to the pc. Otherwise, you could have a list of a thousand terminals.

If you have the pc's goal and modifier, you have a list of maybe only ten or twenty, if it's the right modifier, and so forth.

Well now, that's assessment use of the modifier. The next use of the modifier is also in assessment, which is this: If you have the pc's modifier, you must realize that you have in your lap a description of the pc in-session every time the rudiments go out. This totally describes the pc in-session.

Now, if it's a raving mad modifier, you know – "and I'll kill everybody – and I will attack and kill everybody in sight" – let's say that was the modifier. Of course, you are the auditor, and every time you have thrown the rudiments out, he has, of course, instantly attacked and killed everybody or tried to, see? Verbally. True it's only verbal because it now is no longer sufficiently hidden to do it in fact, see? Indifferently in view, one of these 3D parts won't really get well dramatized. But that was his behavior in session.

All right. Supposing you had a pc with a modifier – "I'll cry and cry until they let me have my own way." Wouldn't that be marvelous? You'd have a pc that was always in grief. If the rudiments went out, the pc would go into grief.

Pc comes in with a present time problem, you don't take it up or clean it up, the pc cries. You think you're running a grief charge. You're not running a grief charge. You're running a modifier.

And you could take this up forever because the only thing that'll discharge the modifier is the Goals Problem Mass itself, but that means a whole 3D run. And you're going to run that on a present time problem? Oh, no, you're not.

So the pc. . . There's the basic rule of this. Now, why? The modifier is that part of the 3D package which dictates reaction to failure. This is how he's going to get even. This is how he's going to react if he fails. This is his conduct in case the goal won't stick. If the goal won't stick . . . See, if he can't make the goal stick, he makes the modifier stick.

Now, he doesn't so much dramatize his goals. He dramatizes this modifier. The modifier, if you noticed on assessment, was much more deeply buried than the goal and therefore much more dramatizable. So if your pc's modifier is "and I'll go straight up in the air and . . ." It doesn't matter what it is. The pc is going to do something that approximates that modifier. And suppose it's something on the subject of "and if they don't do it I will just get up and leave and show them." And you'll have a pc that will blow session, walk to the door, show you something, and go out. Every time.

And you could actually detect the pc's modifier, but it would be a wild thing to try to get it, and it's no type of assessment, but I'm just showing you the longbow. You could certainly make a good guesstimate of a pc's modifier as to his session conduct. This is the way it happens in session. If the rudiments go out, this is what he does. Therefore, his modifier is. See, you could just say those things just one, two, three.

Well, the misemotionalness of the pc on this subject or the upset of the pc is simply not having been able to make any progress on the thing. And he feels that he's been handed a failure, and he conceives himself up against an enemy. You at that moment are the oppterm no matter what his oppterm is. He's got you identified with it. And he will even in his speech – you can sometimes weed out some of the wild statements pcs make, actually make very good sense after you know their oppterm or their terminal or something It just makes very good sense. You know exactly what they were talking about now.

"And you can put that in a pot and boil it," you see. "You'd be pretty good at pressing my pants, but you certainly wouldn't be any good" – he's saying this to a male auditor, you see – "you certainly wouldn't be any good at auditing me."

You know, if you had records of all this, you could almost guess at the fellow's oppterm, you see. Oppterm possibly wife or something like this. It'll be some conduct – or cook or something, see.

It's very interesting that session conduct is based on the 3D mass. You'll get very good reality on this. And then you'll get good reality on how this 3D has influenced the fellow's life if even in an auditing session he dramatizes parts of it even after they've been found. Well, that is quite remarkable. That is very remarkable. So the modifier is very valuable to know in an assessment because you can always make the meter read if you can get the modifier repeated.

Now, this is very cute. Now, I give you this weapon with some diffidence because somebody, sooner or later, is still going to shortcut the weapon. He's just going to use the weapon, not get the rudiments in and then use the weapon, you know? You can make anybody's needle read if you know the modifier and if it's the right modifier.

The reason ARC breaks don't register on the E-Meter is that an out rudiments cause the modifier to go into action which then, if it has a denyer, a comm lag, a bouncer, a down bouncer, or anything of the sort, is dramatized by the pc, and he leaves the zone of attention, so nothing said to him after that registers on the meter. And that's the exact mechanic of an E-Meter not registering on a pc. And that's the only instance where an E-Meter doesn't register on the pc is when the modifier goes into action. Well, the modifier goes into action because the rudiments go out. So the rudiments go out, so the pc has been handed a failure.

There is a failure in life. What is a def – common denominator to the beginning rudiments of a session. Failure in life. Failure at the project that he's working on. Isn't that right?

Auditor's supposed to be auditing him, and instead of that, why, they're talking about something else, you see. And he's supposed to be getting an assessment, and they're doing something else. And he comes into the session and he has a PTP, but the PTP has to be run, and you have to handle the PTP, and you can't help but handle the PTP, and you would be shot if you didn't handle the PTP, but it is an ARC break if you do so because he wants to get auditing

All right. So you go ahead and handle it, and all of a sudden you – you handle it. You handle it all right, but for some reason or other, the thing just disappears, and then the lists are kind of null. And nothing assesses out on the lists. What's this? Well, you didn't handle it all the way. You handled it only up to the point where it kicked in the modifier. And the modifier has now kicked in in its full action, and so the meter doesn't register because the modifier is alive, and that's all you can say about it. Very amusing.

Now, let's give it much more succinctly, you see. The modifier is "I'll leave." Pc has an ARC break, you ask him if he has an ARC break, the needle doesn't register. Why doesn't it register? He's left. Remember you're auditing a thetan. You're not auditing a body. This would absolutely amaze a psychologist because, of course, the person is still in the chair. Oh, are they?

Now, a modifier can reactivate the bank in such a way as not-know anything which is a method of leaving knowingness. And actually a modifier can influence the reactive mind. And it can actually influence the E-Meter which is really fantastic. But you would expect things like this if you were handling the package, which if cleared up would clear somebody, or which the person ha – which does explain their behavior, sicknesses, and everything else. If all of these things are explicable by the package, of course, everything else is explicable by the package such as their electronic pattern reaction.

Now, a pc who goes out of contact with the body whether by more deeply interiorizing into it, leaving the epicenters, departing from it to a point of nullness in the head, just sort of giving up and going blank – we don't care what – you'll get no activation of the whole reactive bank, which is pretty terrific, to show you the value of the modifier.

So his "I'll leave and never find out about it," let's take a modifier like that. Now, that's really nice, isn't it? It's got a bouncer, and it's got a denyer connected with it, and your meter will go null on it.

So the rudiments are out? So the favorite check for rudiments in is, of course, to check a 3D item. You want to know if the rudiments are in, check a 3D item. Say his terminal to him twice. Say his terminal to him. "Snail, snail." Got a reaction. Fine. Rudiments are in. That's elementary, isn't it?

So if you really were alert in a session, you'd say, "Well, all right. We'll begin the session now and so on and so on. Everything fine," And go through your ARC break routine. You know, I mean, "Talk to me." "Snail, snail. All right." And no reaction.

Oh, well, brother, let's roll up our sleeves. There's no run today. This kind of an attitude, you see. Let's get this thing back in action. Let's get the rudiments in.

But "snail" reacted? One of the parts of – it's any part of the 3D package, you see. The oppterm, anything All right. Kick, kick. So you hit the next part of the rudiments, *brrrrt,* hit the next part of the rudiments, *brrrrt,* next part. Now, run your bracket commands. Here we go. See, you're to it within a minute. Within a minute after you find the terminal is reading, you should be auditing, because the rudiments aren't out. They're in. You hardly even have to watch the meter to see if you got a knock on the thing.

The thing is sufficiently in to run, so run it. Don't waste any time with it.

But "snail" didn't register. Oh, let's say you were assessing, and this catastrophe occurred. And you did have a part. You had already found the oppterm, so you said to him – this was a snail, you know – and you said, "Snail, snail."

Well, now, let's go to work and find the ARC break and find the havingness situation, and let's find the present time problem, and let's get it all squared around. And let's see if we

get a read that way. If we do, we're good. Pat ourselves on the back. We're pretty good. We're pretty good. Because we got the rudiments in, in spite of the modifier which we know very well was kicked in.

And if we don't have the modifier yet, we better look for it. We better get the goal and get the modifier. Old 3A style if this kind of – if this is the kind of assessment that is going on. Let's get the modifier as soon as we possibly can get the modifier before we monkey with anything else, because it's going to take us forever to get other things.

And after we've got the modifier, we're looking for the oppterm. Or we're looking for the terminal, let's say. And we're looking for the terminal, so we say – we've got the oppterm – "Snail, snail." No read.

But we found the modifier which was "and get the hell out of here." So we say, "Snail, snail." No reaction. No read. Let's get the rudiments in as very best as we can. Let's take it up. Let's get the pc willing to talk to us. Let's get all the rudiments in and then let's throw him a real curve.

And let's say to him, "And get the hell out of here. Thank you. And get the hell out of here. Thank you. And get the hell out of here. Thank you. And get the hell out of here. Thank you." Your needle will be reading. Elementary, my dear Watson. You kick out the bouncer.

But remember the bouncer won't kick out if your rudiments are out. If the rudiments are severely out, you've actually got to get the rudiments in before you can kick the bouncer out. But it's just that last little touch that brings the needle back to a hot read.

Now, let's say we're assessing very well, and we've just had a beautiful mark here, and this one was live, and this one was live, and this one was live, and they were all live.

And we go back over the top of the list again. It was only ten items we got there, and that's awful easy and we go over the top of this thing again. And we say, "Snail, waterbuck, izzard." Whatever it is, you know. And wait a minute. There were two of them there alive and they're now null. And then we say, "Lion. Tiger. Waterbuck." They're still all null. Well, we either have the thing, and we've either knocked it in so we finish the rest of the list. And if they all went null, well, it either isn't on the list or the meter's gone null. But any time you think the meter's gone null, quote a known, tested part of the package.

You already found the oppterm? All right. "Tiger. Tiger. Tiger. Tiger." You get a kick? Rudiments are in. No kick? Oh, well, here we go. And if we were reading along nulling list and we just didn't have time to clean up rudiments, we would be tempted, of course, to say to the pc, "And get the hell out of here. And get the hell out of here. And get the hell out of here. And get the hell out of here." Kick, see. "And get the hell out of here." Needle kick. Finish the rest of the list. Crude but effective. Best thing to do is to get the rudiments in and

then do it. But this is why people's needles go null. And that is an important piece of technology for you, a auditor. Very important.

I think you will find this bears out very, very well, bears out extremely well over a long period. The trick is, do you have the right modifier. Now, if you've got the oppgoal and you're calling it the pc's goal, and you get a modifier to the oppgoal, and then nothing happens with this trick, it's the oppgoal. There is probably something wrong with it there. Because it doesn't have the effect on the pc. And you could usually prove out a modifier: Is this what the pc does when he has an ARC break in session? That kind of proves out the modifier. Does the pc show any shadow of this? Is there anything like this around?

All right. Well, that is the way you patch them up when you've already got them, you got parts of it. But your interest on the thing is to keep a person who has started in with Scientology and into auditing going. And the best way to keep him going at this stage of the game and today is, of course, to tell him the truth. Tell him where he'll wind up and where he's got to go.

And you'll find people will believe the truth if it's the truth. Not to kid him along or cajole him along. Just make a good statement of where they're going, and what they'll probably go through and what will probably happen to them, and what probably they will – and how they will wind up. Give them some kind of a notion of this.

They get a reality on that because it is the truth. That's the most reason they get a reality on it. And you'll find that trying to soften the track for a person, trying to soften it all up and say, "Well, it isn't very tough, and there isn't very anything. It's very easy, and all you have to do is push button A and then you get button B, and so forth. All you've got to do is this and this and this. And that's very simple. There's nothing much to it. That's all."

You give him a lose. You better tell them the truth in the first place.

The truth about Scientology today includes this interesting fact. Johannes Q. Glip comes in his wheelchair into the front of the Central Organization, and he says, "Well, I don't know. That last auditing wasn't any good. I still have the pain in my head."

A truthful auditor would say, "What was your last auditing?"

"Well, I was being security checked, and I had a Problems Intensive, and that should have taken care of the whole thing"

Tell him cruelly but very truthfully, "That somatic in your head? That isn't going to clean up until you're Clear. We can make it less. We can make it more comfortable, but it will turn up higher than that before you're Clear. Only one known way to take it away forever, and that's to clear you. There isn't any way else. We can key it out, but we can't guarantee that it will stay out. It could go out and go in. We can make you feel happier. We can make you feel better. We can get you over having an itchy tip to your nose, or something like this. But you're

worried about basic and fundamental problems such as weight, worried about problems such as migraine headaches. We can key these things out. We can make you feel much better, but it'll probably turn on again before you're Clear. And the only time it'll ever turn off is after you've gone through the Goals Problem Mass."

They'll say, "What's that?"

"Oh, well, that's what you go through that you would feel many times while going through it that you would be better off dead. And it's probably true."

You needn't be quite so cruel, but you could err on the side, "Well, it's very simple, and there's nothing to it."

Then the person's expectancy isn't up to what he meets.

The Goals Problem Mass gives you many interesting phenomena. The story of the amount of phenomena which turns on during a Goals Problem Mass is a long story. There are many weird phenomena, such as when you're running pictures and engrams, of course, you're supposed to sit there seeing pictures and engrams. And the person running the Goals Problem Mass doesn't see enough pictures to put in your eye on the first dozen levels.

And then he keeps telling you, "Well, I don't get any pictures," and then you find out he's been getting entirely different pictures on his last two levels than he ever got before, but he can't see them very well. And he's giving you the same problem over and over and over on question one. It's always the same problem no matter what he is running. It's always the same problem. It's always the same problem. And after you've run fifteen levels, he all of a sudden comes up with a different problem. Well, what do you know? You've had a change.

And these black masses all of a sudden turn into pictures, and different parts of the track suddenly start appearing that you've never seen before. Various tricks of mass, cold waves, somatics, pains in back, various other types of things that turn on – all quite standard. And I'd say to this degree that if they're absent, there isn't anything happening.

But actually the phenomena of all of this is quite a story in itself. I could talk for quite a while on just the phenomena connected, and sensations and that sort of thing, with Clearing, and those indicators.

That wasn't what I've been trying to tell you about in this lecture. I've been trying to tell you the person's general reaction and pattern and ways and means of steering it off or anticipating it while they were going through from the first contact with Scientology and through Clear. And I hope I've given you a little data on this which can help you and possibly, in looking at yourself, you get a better reality on what people are going through.

And people going through this line, if you understand what they are going through, will have a great deal more confidence in you because you're telling them the truth rather than patting them on the back, and so forth.

Don't ever try to lighten it up. Play it on the other side if you have to. Don't rave about it and scare them to death. Every once in a while you have a pc sit down in the auditing chair. And he's very worried. He hasn't got all of his Goals Problem Mass yet. And he's auditing somebody on it, and then he comes around and starts to go through it himself, and he gets apprehensive.

Or he has had no familiarity with it, and he gets his whole package, and he thinks everything is fine, and then he is almost eaten up with apprehension about it. He doesn't quite know what the devil he's going to run into next. He expects everything will happen at once. He's usually quite disappointed that it takes many levels before very much happens.

His somatics are slow and painful and crummy, and he gets up in the morning, and he looks in the mirror, and he looks like the same person. Trouble is he can't look in the mirror on Day 1 and Day 10 as a consecutive look, see? If he did that, he would see a difference. But instead of that he looks on Day 3 and Day 4. He looks no different that he can tell. Same hollow-eyed, baggy, his own old self. But expectancy is quite high, and what is viewed is this and it's that.

But you're on a road which the further you advance on it the better reality you get on it. There isn't any question in your mind but what you are going someplace, and that something is happening, and so on.

And then, of course, there's those four levels where all cognitions turned off. Not a single cognition for four consecutive levels. You didn't even think of a thing, after absolutely just thinking your brains out for several levels, marvelous, you know, marvelous. Then four levels just plug, plug, plug, and then nothing happened. And then all of a sudden on the fifth level, why, it's all cognitions again, you see. And it's all different.

Change is the main thing Does the person change as he goes along? Does he make gradual progress forward? My greatest test for whether or not the person is on the right road: Are they looking better and feeling worse? If they're looking worse and feeling better, I get suspicious. We must be running the wrong side.

No kidding, though. Appearance to me is my best test because I'm pretty good at observation. I can usually look at a person and tell them they're running the right side or the wrong side. And then they expect me to give them fancy reasons why, so I fool them, I tell them.

I tell them some reasons why, but it was because I looked at them. That's why.

I say, "Uh-uh. Uh-uh. Uh-uh. No, no, no, no. No pc of mine ever developed a brilliant green skin."

Well, anyhow, that's the way it goes, and that's the anticipatory line, and you yourself add a great deal of subjective reality to this particular item and these various items. But it's a

road which is now a pretty well plotted road and which I hope many can travel. It's not a simple road. It requires much greater technical skill than we have ever before had to deliver and much upgraded from anything we ever had thought necessary.

Well, it just makes it tougher on the auditor. It just makes it necessary to do more teaching. It makes it necessary for all of us to be more careful as to who uses it. What audits it. What audits what. You got the idea? And that we get this thing lined up and get its ethical level fairly high, and stamp like mad on illegal uses that will louse up people – which they can easily do with these processes, and we just have to be more alert to that – and we'll all make it one of these days, I think. You're teaching me that everyday, for which I thank you.

Thank you.