POINTS IN ASSESSING

A lecture given on
7 June 1961

Thank you.

I was going to say I can always tell when somebody is mad at me: They don't come to my lectures. That happens to be a coordinated fact, you know that? People who don't – haven't attended my lectures in the past in Central Organizations, eventually squirreled in some fashion. Odd. Peculiar. So I always look around to see who's there, you know? It's my Security Check.

All right. Now, this is the 7th of June, isn't it?

Audience: Right. Uh-huh..

Marcabian intelligence report date – something or other. Did you hear about the Marcabians who had to PDH the Thedeans who had to – in order to make Frank Sullivan safe for democracy. Anyhow – ah, it's a wonderful life.

All right. Now, I lectured to you yesterday on HCOB June 5, 1961 [PROCESSES ALLOWED]. Tried to give you some very fast general coverage concerning it, and this bulletin was issued to you today. This bulletin is based totally and completely on what we have found people would do and what people can do. And they can do these. And although I can tell you innumerable ways to punch buttons on cases, innumerable ways to become aesthetically telepathic about cases, read their facsimiles and all kinds of weird things like this, it doesn't happen that over the last eleven years people have uniformly been able to duplicate this. So as a result, we have techniques and technologies, and we have taken it all down out of the beautiful esoterics of esoteric and have got it well situated now into the ponderous clank of something that can be totally understood and duplicated. Okay?

The trick of communication in Dianetics and Scientology is the interesting trick back of all the tricks. That is the one thing that has been the most difficult and is probably the greatest achievement. Other people might look at other things, but learning how to get things understood is one of the most difficult things – without developing a large vocabulary.

We could easily do this by inventing eighteen dictionaries and the 8,000 new terms you have to learn as a medical student and so forth – and we've got somewhere around 400 terms that

are – 472 terms, I think, include all of the oddball ones we don't even use. In common usage, I think a Scientologist's vocabulary probably isn't over about 75 or 80 words that are completely strange and peculiar and have their own meanings. But once you define these words – once these words are defined – people look at them and realize there was no such word. See, so we've had to make something that sounds like English, you see, then mean something. And it's very odd – as soon as I get out the dictionary – which I'm doing – I do that between 7:00 A.M. and 7:05 on my schedule.

I must have an overt on buzz saws though. I did get to bed for a couple hours sleep this morning, and I no more than closed my eyes, than Farmer Jones opened up on a buzz saw. And you know, he is perfectly tuneless on the thing. He can't play it worth a darn. So he has now got another black mark in his book and our books. And factually – not for that reason at all – everybody is being very fed up, because they open up his book now and they find nothing but total black pages. You know, he's run out of black marks.

But trying to communicate to him, for instance, anything about anything is a very good example. Here's an actual example: You try to explain what the situation is all about. You draw a blank. You draw a complete blank. But he responds like mad to processing Even anything as corny as a Touch Assist.

I ran an engram on him one day standing out in the front drive. The odd part of it was his hand recovered and everything else. He'd been kicked by a cow in a milk pail. And at first he thought the milk pail had kicked him. He didn't know when it happened. He couldn't locate when it occurred. It was sometime between breakfast and supper. He didn't know at what moment what had happened. He had no clue, and he was having a rough time. And his hand was all crippled up, and he couldn't milk. So I stood him out here in the front drive and ran out a bad hand. He became rather pathetically curious afterwards as to what we *were* doing.

There's no language to talk about it, you see? That's the trouble you have, you see? The no-language barriers. It's the no-language barrier. These words do not exist in the language because the understanding didn't exist in the language.

Now, words are based on agreed-upon understandings. And English is a Johnny-come-lately language. Most of these postulates hadn't been made or thought of for the last 200 trillion years. You're going to express them in English? People don't even know these principles.

However, you tell him a definition of a word, carefully, using, oh, I don't know, using twenty, thirty words, something like that – a definition of a word – he doesn't latch onto the word rapidly because the concept is brand-new to him, and he's rather stonied by the definition. This is something that's never occurred to him before. He can sense the truth of it. Something is going

ding, ding, ding. "That's true, you know. That's true. You know?" But he can't quite grasp it. And while he's still in the throes of grasping this, recognizing there is a truth there, if you threw right on top of it a condensation of your explanation and his cognition in just the few letters contained in one word, you've almost collapsed the track on him, don't you see? He has to realize the principle before he can take the word. You got that?

It goes reversewise. A child has to find out that the stove is warm before he begins to understand what "warm stove" means, don't you see? Now on a thought level they have to understand the concept. Well, this is almost like processing.

It used to be fellows would read the Axioms and read things about it and get all sorts of cognitions. And you know, *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science:* We have numerous cases of people in hospitals having been given this or finding it, and just reading the book and throwing back the covers and getting up and sliding into their shoes, much to the horrors of the nurse, and leaving and never being sick again.

What did this? It was basically a resurge of hope that there was some understanding of all this, don't you see? But it was the understanding alone. So the understanding operates as processing. You got it? It operates that way – it's clarifications.

Well, until you have somebody who has wrapped his wits around some of the principles, so that he isn't still going, "Let me see. Are all men bad? Are all men good? I wonder if all men are good. All men are bad. There probably is two different kinds of people. There's the good people and the bad people."

I knew a nut one time that used to say, "Well, there are two kinds of people: there are happy people and unhappy people. And you're an unhappy person." And then she would add gloomily, "And I'm a happy person." See, she had this all worked out.

And if you all of a sudden shoot something in and say, "People are thetans. And there's the overt – motivator sequence, and what they do to others, why, they think is done to them;" boy, you've just fired a philosophic salvo of fleet intensity. See? *Wham! You* know, and everything is reverberating from horizon to horizon, you see. And you say, "Now do you get the word 'overtmotivator sequence'? Oh, you don't understand the word yet. Well, you're stupid." And in training people, they actually have to learn the principles before they learn the words.

That'll make this dictionary rather interesting reading, because they look at the word, and they're perfectly willing to commit that to memory. And then they read the definition, and the fleet salvo reverberates from horizon to horizon, and they say, "What word was that? What word was that? You know? You know? That's submerged. That's gone. What are we connected with? What planet is this?" you know? That kind of thing. And then they finally come around and they

say – they look at it again, and then they look at it again and then they run into it with familiarity. And then they get more and more familiar with it. And then all of a sudden they know the word. See, they can package it, because the understanding of it is so easily understood that it is thoughtwise transmittable. You got the idea? Until that time, they can't learn a vocabulary.

Now, you can do anything you want to, to teach people how to learn a vocabulary, but you run against the principle of the communication of the idea that is packaged in the word. And these ideas have not been familiar to man.

All right. Doing that in a relatively simple way might look complicated to people simply because their basic difficulty is trying to grasp some principle. And they haven't got a good idea of what an overt-motivator sequence is, and every time they try to face it, you know, it sort of blows the words "overtmotivator sequence"; they become meaningless. And what they haven't done is grasp the principle of the overt-motivator sequence. It is not that they haven't grasped the word. They could spout the word parrot-fashion, but they cannot understand this other principle, don't you see? See what we're connecting up when we're training people.

Actually, we know – would have no sounder method of educating somebody than teaching him the principles of Scientology under the guise of teaching him the vocabulary of Scientology. Got the idea? They couldn't help but have a repercussion.

All right. Now similarly, the operational actions which we undertake apparently are liable to shortness of understanding or misunderstanding Therefore, what will be done and what can be done by a person in Scientology, by a Scientologist, is monitored by what he can easily understand and what he is willing to perform. And you have that right here, and this is quite a triumph, this HCOB June 5.

Now, to a nontrained person, this bulletin would probably be gobbledygook, because it doesn't explain too much here. It's dependent on other publications, you see? It says CCHs. Well, of course, we've been through the ropes and we know what the CCHs are, but that wouldn't mean anything to – oh, I don't know – Menninger, presuming he's still alive.

"CCHs. Oh, must be something made up. Something made up."

"No," you say, "No. It's a repetitive thing. It's actually control, communication and havingness. When you apply control, you obtain communication, which gives the preclear havingness. And it is a method of entrance on cases which is rather infallible. And that's what CCHs mean." Look where you'd leave Menninger. See? He wouldn't be around there, that's all.

In the first place, you've enunciated to him a principle that psychiatry, if it had any teeth left, would give them all if they had a formula by which they could actually bring back some sanity, see? They haven't got that. So you've thrown him this formula and control to him is

electric-shocking people, and communicating with people is electric-shocking people, and havingness to him is electric shock or psychosis. So it adds up to him: "Well, control, communication – it'll drive people crazy." Get the idea? His adjudication. You see how he'd arrive at the point where "it'd drive people crazy," because his havingness is psychotics. This is all the havingness the man has, obviously. See, so control – that's electric shocking people. And communication – that's electric shocking people, because he knows you can't, see? And havingness – well, that's electric shocks and psychosis. Oh, psychosis. You can have psychosis, so that if you ran the CCHs on anybody, you'd drive them crazy. And they electric-shock people because it drives them crazy.

You see, you're baffled because you don't realize that you're dealing with short-circuited thinking. You know: A=A=A, therefore you do it. Fact equals fact equals contrary fact, so you dramatize it. So you're not even in that case dealing with thinking. As the – I'm not berating these people. I'm merely saying there couldn't be any thinking because there's bulletin after bulletin that they themselves put out continually, saying that surgery and electric shock do nothing but harm people. And they go right on ordering them and doing them, you see, so that it must be a short-circuited thinkingness. So you're not penetrating at that level at all. Now how are you going to penetrate?

You say to this fellow, "All right. Now look. Joburg Processing Check. That is a series of questions which are asked the person to obtain from them data which they ordinarily have not handed out." And right away, Menninger says, "Ah, Catholic church." See? *Thu-thup! So* we now have the fact that we are driving people crazy by using the mechanisms of the Catholic church. You get how you get a no-think out of this? This would be the no-think.

Well, it's very interesting to see how these things add up. But they are not gobbledygook to you because you've experienced a great many of these things – experienced them all. The only thing you possibly haven't experienced is being Clear, and you possibly have not seen a Clear floating needle.

As a matter of fact, I told an auditor in HGC London the other day that they ought to take the pc around and show the auditors a Clear free floating needle. And I got into the most oddball yippety-yap you ever heard of. Why? Because this is an unfamiliarity. We're in a zone of unfamiliarity, and even the despatch was misinterpreted. It caused a great deal of randomity, this despatch. The pc got hold of it and interpreted it that I had – was forcing upon her the concept that she was Clear. The auditor must have interpreted it similarly because never showed it – this Clear floating needle type needle – to any of the other auditors. The only thing I wanted them to do. if anybody had cared to read the thing – the only thing I wanted them to do – was to be able to look at a floating needle. Nobody had ever seen one up there, see? And this is a floating needle.

And it was a wonderful opportunity for somebody to see a floating needle. Instead of that, pc is ARC broke and it has to be run in the next session.

Look at the randomity that suddenly developed here. Pretty wild, you know? You say, "Auditors, I want you to show a floating needle." Pc has an ARC break. Auditor doesn't go anywhere near anybody. Pc has a present time problem. The auditor is mad at me because I've upset the pc. See? Pc was haunting HCO – shouldn't have been – watching things coming in over the telex. Oh, wild.

Well, look, that's the only thing on this bulletin that the auditors in London wouldn't have a fair familiarity with at this stage. And it caused randomity. Got it? So it takes a little while to develop an understanding of things. Right?

You shouldn't be teaching somebody above their zones of reality, really. But you can reach them with processing and they then do gain a subjective reality on the thing. And you can reach them in numerous ways, don't you see? And you actually could teach them a bunch of these philosophic-level principles and then they'd get – even get a vocabulary if they got a subjective grasp on these things. But it's an auditing process. It blows enturbulation off the case. And while it is blowing off the case, the case feels confused. So the instant reaction of Menninger is, "This is terribly confusing. I haven't got anything to do with it."

I had a psychiatrist reading *Dianetics,* and he was rushing out every few minutes and putting the electrodes on somebody and coming back in. And he says, "Yes. Yes. I've looked at this book. I've – this book came in the other day. It came in the other day. And I looked at it, and I've looked it over. And I've reported it to the association. I think it's disgraceful." And he says, "I'm a Horney." I said, "Well what philosophy do you follow in your psychoanalysis?"

He says, "I'm a Horney man myself. I'm a Horney man." And he rushed out and strapped and shocked somebody else and came back in again. And he says, "I'm a Horney man."

And I said, "Well . . ." I saw it while he was gone, I saw the book Horney, Karen Horney. So I said, "Well, what is Horney? What is the Horney offshoot *of* Freudian analysis?" and so on.

He says, "I don't know. I never read it."

It'd be different if I was telling you that for a gag. But actually that's totally factual. Unbelievably true. He was a Horney man, but he'd never read anything by Horney. I don't know – how do you get it? Telepathic?

I think they'd call it probably, Freudianly, "telepathic emission," something like that. If you keep a book on a shelf long enough, why, you get it by contagion or something. Maybe some

years later he expected as long as the book sat on the shelf, why, he would become all of a sudden imbued with its characteristics.

Well anyway, none of this bulletin, to a Scientologist, is apparently incomprehensible. And the only place a Scientologist gets in trouble out in the field and untrained, is in doing Goals Assessments. And trying to run SOP Goals, he can run into too many things.

Now, for instance, we've just run into one on a case today. Case was apparently flat on a level on the case's terminal. Apparently flat, but wasn't. Wasn't. Couldn't have been, because the case was still worried about the level.

Well, we were running the principle of running the rock slam out of the needle rather than running the motion out of the tone arm. And now a question enters: Is this right? I mean, is it right just to run the rock slam out or should you actually flatten that level?

But nevertheless, this case does not answer the problem, because this case might have had a present time problem not detected by the auditor or, after the rudiments were checked out, suddenly had a present time problem. See, the rudiments sort of boost the case's reality, and all of a sudden the case realizes it has a present time problem, so now doesn't get a rock slam. You see, the process isn't biting. Actually, their mind is on something else so the auditor *thinks it is flat.*

Tone arm motion reduced, in other words, by reason of a rudiment out. And the tone arm moving so little that the auditor would be brought to the conclusion that it was flat. I would be brought to the conclusion it was flat, reading the report, don't you see? So we go off and assess for another level. And then we come back and find the rock slam there 100 percent, because some PTPs have been handled on the pc.

In other words, we have this odd adjudication that we can put on running terminals, and that is that if a pc has a rudiment out, a level can look flat which isn't. And you can put that down in your book, because we've just discovered it and proved it out factually. Because when we went back to this level – *two levels* have been run since, but the case was bogging.

And in patch-up of cases on general run of Prehav and on patch-up of cases in general – of a general run of the terminal – of the goal, if a case isn't making much progress, you had better go back – that's why you must keep your auditor's reports. This is the way to patch one up, is go back and pick the earliest level run and that might not have been flat, and flatten the level, and come on up to the next level after that and flatten that, because that will now probably be unflat. In other words, you've got to flatten every level now that you've left unflat, and all levels will tend to be unflat, since the level you left unflat. You got it?

So you must keep your reports. The case apparently bogs. Well, the case had a PTP and an ARC break or something like that, and it wasn't detected, and for that reason the tone arm

ceased to move, and you say the level is flat. And it's not, and you run a few more levels, and all of a sudden the case is having more and more PTPs, and more and more obsessed with upsets and problems and so forth.

Well, the way to patch that up is to go back and review the tone arm figures on each level that was run at its end. See? Get the end run. Review the last twenty minutes of every process level that has been run on the pc. Okay? And pick the earliest one that you suspect may not be flat. Got it? And to be on the safe side, pick the earliest one that you suspect. But you could – there could be a little bit later one that you might suspect more, but you wouldn't quite be able to decide. Well, if you couldn't quite decide – it usually will be quite obvious to you – but if you couldn't decide – well, go back and pick the earliest candidate and run it, because they'll flatten off rather quickly. You got it?

Now, take *all* the motion out of the level this time. Just run it down to a point of where it just grinds to a brake-smoking halt. Hm?

Now, what else would you do to patch it up? Well, if you've done a good Goals Assessment, you've got the hidden standards. You know, the person always looks and finds out if his right ear is no longer burning, so he knows the process is working. This is the standards. Lots of people have these standards. And these standards are actually present time problems of magnitude of long duration. And you're running a case with a PT problem that has a hidden standard. See? Well, why run this? Now you would do much better to use what it says here about handling problems of longtime duration under Routine 27 second page. Problems of long duration.

Now, we mean by a problem of *long* duration, years or within this lifetime. The problem must have existed for years or in this lifetime. Otherwise, it's a PT problem. It's less than a year; it's only months or weeks, hours, minutes, seconds: it's a present time problem of short duration. These are simply artificial labels to give you an order of magnitude.

So the difference between a present time problem of short duration and a present time problem of long duration are quite important to you, because you handle a present time problem of short duration always in the rudiments only. Don't take it into Prehav or into processes or anything like that. Just put it into the rudiments. And the rudiments processes that are supposed to be run in the rudiments *will* handle it, and you shouldn't do any more about it than that.

But a present time problem of *long* duration, which means more than a year and less than a lifetime – this lifetime, see – you do a Terminal Assessment just like you were doing a Goals Assessment. And you just keep hammering and hammering and hammering and running and running. And it's not something you do in twenty minutes, the way I've been getting it in auditor reports. "Well, we did a Terminals Assessment for the present time problem of long duration, and

then we assessed for the level, and we immediately got to running it." And you look up at the assessment, and it's five minutes. Oh? Five minutes? How interesting.

You mean you could get a list of all terminals which might be involved in this problem and do an assessment by elimination in five minutes? Oh, yes. Like hell you could. You're looking at a couple of sessions, man! Let's get real. This person has a hidden standard. His right ear – he knows whether processes are working because his right ear doesn't burn. But when his right ear is burning, why, then he knows a process isn't working.

You had a case go through HGC London a very short time ago who had some kind of a peculiar thing of some kind. It was something as unlovely, I think, as a – if you will excuse me – a vaginal discharge and when this lessened, the process was working and when it got increased, the processes weren't working, and everything was being barometered by this rather fantastic action.

Now, that's nothing against anybody. You'd have to find that out. Oh, look. There is something connected here that is real to the pc. It must be more real to the preclear than the preclear's case, by automatic definition, because the pc uses it as an indicator for his case so that this thing must then be a substitute for his case. You got that? I mean, a *substitute* for the case. That's why you must know about hidden standards!

In other words, the hidden standard is more real to the pc than any case or life difficulties he is having, because he tries to find out if *it is* functioning or not functioning. He's sort of packing an E-Meter around on the side of his head, don't you see? You got the idea? Well, his attention *obviously* – this is merely a problem of attention.

There hasn't been a lecture, by the way, on attention and dispersed attention, attention units and so forth since, I think, something ridiculous like the end of June 1960 at the Elks Hall in – it was – must have been someplace in New Jersey – Elizabeth! Mmmm! The Elks Hall in Elizabeth, New Jersey. There was a whole hour lecture at that particular time on the subject of attention units and how they are trapped in the bank, and the individual is running only on 1 percent or 2 percent of the theoretical 100 percent of attention available to him, because his attention is pinned down in other places of the bank, you see?

Well, that's very, very interesting to us today to all of a sudden have this old one suddenly leap into view, full-armed, see? Because here it is; here it is. You're working with it right now. You're assessing for a goal to find out where the person has most of his attention. You're assessing for the terminal and immediately the goal would disintensify that you find the terminal really, because, of course, the attention is really fixed on the goal *because* it is fixed on the terminal. And the second it gets fixed on the terminal, you've rather unfixed it on the goal, so the goal will read less after you've been assessing terminals a little while.

All right. Your next point here is that if the pc has his attention on a burning right ear, well, for heaven's sakes, it's practically a total computation sitting right there on the side of the pc's head. So what do you do? You say, "What is it now? Has that been – have you worried about that for some time?" You say, "Well, what would have to happen to you for you to know that Scientology works?" That is the cute question.

The pc always answers up and they give you some of the most remarkable answers you ever heard in your life. "Well, to know that Scientology really works, my daughter would have to get over her hives."

Oh, come on. This person's attention isn't even on himself. But nevertheless that is the answer. "Well now, has your daughter having hives been a problem to you for a long . . ."

"Oh, well yes. Specialists. Take him up to Pennsylvania, take him up to Wyoming, and we've gone down south. We've gone practically every place. We've imported special bees to sting her and followed the very best directions we possibly can. She still has these hives. And we keep rubbing pickle juice into them all the time. And every night I have to get up five times a night and rub pickle juice into her hives so that she can sleep. And this has been going on for some years. And I actually feel guilty about it myself, you see, because one day she walked up to the stove when she was just a little child and – she did. And I spilled onion juice all over her. Well now, ever since that time I think she's had these hives."

Hey, what better indicator do you want? You say something about the problem, and your pc goes off like a small firecracker, see? Like a string of ladyfinger firecrackers, you know. Pop, pop, pop, pop, pop, pop, pop. Pc real interested. Yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap. *Brrrrrr*. Yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap. Where do you think their attention is? Attention is on daughter's hives. So to clear this pc, you have to get her daughter's hives out of the way. But you get her concern as a pc's attention off of these hives. If the hives cure up, it's totally coincidental. But they might.

Now, here's the hidden standard. And this hidden standard keeps more people from getting released or cleared than any other single thing I know of except withholds. See? So it's just junior in rank to withholds for holding people up and holding cases up, you know? And actually, the present time problem is right on the goals chain. Always is. Otherwise it couldn't be a problem of long duration. It's somehow connected with it. So if you scrape the top off, the case assesses much more rapidly. That's the least that would happen.

And you might find yourself thoroughly, straight on the goals line if you did a very good assessment. You've short-circuited the whole thing, and this is running like a bomb, and after you've run three levels on this present-time-problem terminal of long duration, you assess the thing very carefully, and you don't find the Prehav Scale live on a dozen levels – oh, *coo! You*

must be straight on the pc's line. And it didn't take you seventy-two hours to do the assessment. It took you more like about five.

So you get the values of a hidden standard? It's something to pay attention to. Something very interesting, besides being terribly amusing. I'll swear I have heard some of the weirdest statements that Homo sap has ever made, I'm sure, when I talk to them about hidden standards.

"What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology worked?"

"Oh, well – well confidentially, whenever I've been processed, I see whether or not my right foot ticks. And if it stops ticking then I know we're on the way, but if it starts ticking, I know we're off." You get the most interesting answers.

Now you say, "What else – " you don't ever ask this, but I've – can pursue the question line in other directions, and it becomes practically ridiculous. You say, "What else do you use this right foot for?" You wouldn't ask that in processing, but you get the most fascinating answers. They sometimes use it to find out if people are mad at them, what the weather is going to be, whether or not the food is going to agree with them, whether or not they're going to be sick. You know, in epilepsy the fellow always knows a certain feeling when he's going to have a fit, see, and he knows if he gets a certain condition, he's going to have a fit. Well, they use these hidden standards the same way. They know they're going to have some bad luck. Well, the nervous stomach, for instance. Fellow's nervous stomach turns on, he knows he's going to have some bad luck. He knows there's some bad luck coming up one way or the other. He uses his stomach to measure the future.

You find all sorts of people – this is the most common one: "Now, what would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?"

"Well, my nervous stomach would have to turn off."

"Oh?" you say, "Your nervous stomach would have to turn off. Well, very interesting. How long have you had this nervous stomach?"

"Well, ever since I was a child."

"Well now, does it ever turn off in processing? Has anything ever turned it off in processing?"

"No. I keep watching it." Then all of a sudden, "*Brrrrrr*, yap, yap, yap, yap. And this auditor and that auditor, and we ran this and we ran that, and we did this and we did that, and the other thing, and so on, and so on, and so on, and this stomach, stomach, stomach, stomach, stomach, stomach, stomach," see? Hidden standard, hidden standard, hidden standard. You got the idea?

Well, it's almost an assessment when you strike the fire on the pc's interest, see? He's going to be in-session on that. Man, is that pc going to be in-session. Well, he's already willing to talk to the auditor about it. He's already interested in it. So his attention must be parked around there someplace.

Now the mistake we have made is, not assessing this nervous stomach.

We can ask all sorts of embarrassing questions, such as, "Whose stomach is it?" We can do a Presession 38 type terminal search. You can do all sorts of things with this thing. They – that's the who – or what, who and when. "What's wrong?" and "Who had that trouble?" and "When did he have it?" It sometimes knocks the whole problem out just discovering this.

But now, instead of running a Presession 38 type of operation on it – it is a faster action but a more – not always a faster action, but more certain, you know – in the interests of certainty – is to do a Terminals Assessment by elimination on this somatic, on this standard item. Is it his ear? Is it his head? Whose head? Whose ear? You got the idea? And we just – whose might it be? And a pc guesses about this thing, and it might be this one's and it might be that one's, and it might be an . You just write all those names down, you see? It might be his inner ear, so you say "inner ear." And it might be his lobe, you know, and you write down "lobe." And it might be his aeroglopis. And you say, "His what?"

Don't challenge it. What you want to find out i6 how to spell it. It's his aeroglopis. And that's the mechanism that lets air in and out of the ear. And you never even knew it existed. Neither does medical science. Nobody has ever known this one before but the pc, you see?

And you'll find that the reason this line of questioning is so intriguing is because, of course, you have hit the primary source of individuation on the pc. This is the one that makes him different from everybody. It's sort of he knows who he is; he's the one that has an earache. So he's different than everybody else, so it's the least duplicated area of the bank. So, of course, it'll fire off as an automaticity because it's most out of communication and therefore most out of control.

So locating the hidden standard and assessing it by elimination, by which you get a long list of terminals. Oh, I don't know, somebody's nervous stomach, you ought to wind up with a list of terminals of something like two hundred, something like that. Big.

Well, ever since we've started doing Goals Assessments on a highly therapeutic level, it is nothing for people to come up with 546 goals, and then come up with 546 terminals on that one goal. This takes some time, and it takes some doing. You don't do assessments in a part of a session and then get the show on the road, because you're usually wrong.

I should talk to you about something in assessments that's just occurred to me. I mentioned it to one auditor a short time ago and used the phrase, and it's never been used before,

but it certainly is something that you should know something about. It's called a cognition surge. And it can throw your whole assessment awry. It's a cognition surge, and this is the source of most of the charge you get on the bank. It isn't – when you're going over a whole bunch of goals and that sort of thing and the individual all of a sudden says, "Well, what do you know? I have always wanted to shoot magpies. And I don't even know what they are."

The E-Meter will react rather violently. It's a cognition surge. It's a release of electrical charge that goes along with the person having a cognition. And if you watch an E-Meter carefully, often when they're having a cognition – a real cognition – you will get a *marked* fall. Well, when you're assessing and you ask for another terminal, the person sometimes all of a sudden says, "Hah! What do you know! Airplane pilot, of course," see. And you get a steep fall that has nothing to do with anything, really, but the fact that he's cognited that he might have had something to do with airplane pilots, and this is what it's falling on. It's sort of on the assoc- possible association, and you'll get a mad drop.

Now, another thing When you're sometimes assessing for a level – which is more common – the individual all of a sudden realizes that there is such a thing as fighting wasps. This has just never occurred to him before, see? And you do – you're reading along, you're reading the assessment, and you're saying – it says, "Fighting Scrapping. Knifing. Burning," and so forth. All right.

Now, right about the time you've entered in this line, you say "Fighting," and you get a great big drop on the needle. And you say, "Boy, with that much drop, that must be it. I won't assess any further," and have you just pulled a bloomer. Because it says "Fighting" and drops like mad, and that's why you always do them at least twice, you see, once up and once down. And the next one, "Burning – scrapping, burning."

Now you come back over the list again, and it says "Fighting," and it is just as dead as a mackerel. And you say, "Well, that is the most peculiar thing How was it so hot when now it's so cold?" Well, you read a cognition surge.

The person – it's a "Whaddaya know! There is a possibility of some time or another fighting a wasp, you know? Ha-ha! Ha! What do you think of that? Ha! Incredible. Nobody could possibly fight a wasp. I always have known that. And here's the idea, but it's a funny thing of I've never thought of this idea before, don't you see?" It isn't the terminal level that you should run. It is simply the fact that he had an idea at that instant. When you come back over it again, it's flat.

There's nothing disappears off a meter faster. Sometimes when you're assessing terminals, you will find that terminal after terminal in turn pick up the cognition surge. And it only lasts for about five or ten questionings on the terminal.

It just – this fellow has never thought of himself as having been even remotely connected with being a rocket jockey. This is not a possible connection, don't you see? And not being a possible connection, of course, you get a tremendous *blauw, bang, thud* at the idea of being connected with a rocket jockey. But it doesn't have anything to do with the fact that the terminal is "rocket jockey." Got the idea?

A cognition surge actually occurs when an associated terminal or associated level to the one you're looking for blows off rather violently. And this happens during assessments of goals, terminals and levels. And when you get a disassociation all of a sudden – the guy all of a sudden gets rid of that one, your meter will react. And your meter won't react again. And the source of probably most bad assessments, or most assessment errors, is when the D of P sets the guy down, it falls off the pin, and they say, "That's the terminal." No. It's not the terminal. That was the charge a terminal made leaving. See?

Now, you ask him again about the same terminal, and you get a little flip, and you ask him again about it, and, man, is it gone. But sometimes a terminal will look terribly hot for about twelve recounts. Just look hotter than a pistol, and the pc is getting interested in it. But the pc's interest is not because he is that terminal or is being that terminal but because that terminal is blowing He has just never inspected the fact that his unknown terminal was connected with this now known terminal. Well, the inspection of this will give you an E-Meter reaction. But it's a very short-duration reaction.

That's why on a goals terminal you grind them out by elimination. That is why on the Terminal Assessment you grind them out by elimination. And a PT problem of long duration you always grind out by elimination, because you'll just get nothing but cognition surge after cognition surge after cognition surge after cognition surge. And it's the one that's left you want. Because all of these things – you've entered, already, a random area. You got a goal fast, you see, which is actually to do something about – only we're not quite sure what – or to learn lessons from a burning right ear, you see? And you're in this *brrrrrrr* area, and so you get all sorts of fireworks on the meter, you know, and terminals blow, and ideas, and he remembers people he never heard of before. Don't be too surprised if you get a couple of hundred terminals, and by the time you've got them all assessed, he says, "What burning ear?" See, don't be too surprised if this occurs. You get how you do this PT problem of long duration?

Now, after you've got the terminal and you do assess it on the Prehav Scale, you of course now run it the same way you do a goals terminal. You just run the levels flat. But they run flat awfully fast, so your twenty-minute rule doesn't apply. You kind of have to watch the needle. And you still can leave one unflat, by the way; have to go back and pick it up. Various things have to be done. Have to retrack your steps.

That's the only other thing I know of in here that you probably don't know-didn't know how to do-I hope you know some more about it now – is the assessment for this. Because I noticed most flubs at the present instant are now being made in assessing and running present time problems of long duration. And the flub just stems from these things. They don't make a terminal list, and they don't do assessment by elimination, and they grab too quick at these cognition surges. Got ,em?

All right. Once more I didn't ask you for any questions today. Some of you are now going to have terrible withholds.

Okay. Is there any fast one anybody really has to know before session tomorrow?