QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD:
ANATOMY AND ASSESSMENT OF GOALS

A lecture given on
15 August 1961

Okay, this is the 16th, isn't it! 15th. Boy, it's a lucky thing you people keep me on the time track. I haven't been reading any newspapers lately. Don't read Russian very well.

16 Aug 19 – 15 Aug 1961. Hiya. Now, I think probably by this time you have a few questions. Good. Come on. A few questions. Yes.

Male voice: Ron, could you put Pretended Knowingness on the Prehav Scale?

Would I put it on there? Yeah. It's probably – probably should be there. Yeah, it's a fairly vital button. The scale of knowingness goes from Not-Know and Pretended Know. Pretended Know could be said to be a harmonic or delusory state of Know. Be an even numbered postulate. I don't know, it must be down there somewhere around six, seven, eight – probably eight. It's probably something in between Remember. Probably six is something on the order of surmise or guess, or something like this. It's pretty late. And as a person comes off of a false knowingness, then they go into an insecurity about knowingness. This bird has studied, let us say, elementary physics, and he's got it all taped. And then he takes nuclear physics. And now he doesn't know whether he knows or not. He can't quite know nuclear physics, you see, and he doesn't dare revert to this. And this accounts for, by the way, the scientific fad and style today.

There's a fad. Science is a sort of a fad. And the fad is more or less this. It's interesting. There's a tone today that is associated with truth. The tone that is associated with truth by the politicians and the lay public. They call them the lay public, you see, because they just lay around, do nothing. And this is a conventionalism. And that is, you must express enormous reservation and doubt. Every sentence must have a doubtful in it. And if you read the thing, it's a doubtful. And this, of course, is nothing but the sheerest of pomposity. They don't doubt.

I mean if you saw – if you are doing scientific observation of experiments and that sort of thing, you don't have to state your conclusion, but neither do you have to doubt your observation. And you dunk a four-foot piece of wood, which is marked in gradient scales of millimeters, into a solution or something of the sort with a lead weight on its end, and after the solution no longer is agitated, and it's no longer bobbing, you look at it, and it says 360, see. 360. And you'd make a record and said 360. You don't say according to observation, which may of course be at fault, I might not have been there, so forth, you see, and it's very, very amusing because more and more and more the hallmark of truth is doubt.

And if you get a real doubtful man, then the public falls for him as a real truthful man. And all this is, is two postulates going together. Know and Not-Know. And they have moved into an insane ridge. The guy doesn't know what he knows. He doesn't know what he Not-Knows. So his total expression is doubt. And occasionally, when societies go real buggy, and when they know nothing about the mind or anything else, and when they're just about three-quarters of the way around the bend, you get this emerging.

You have some great writer all of a sudden says, "Well, I say that man's greatest ability is the divine doubt." And they deify this thing called doubt. What do you mean doubt? Doubt at once says I am unable to find out, and I don't know, but actually I don't know that I don't know, and I guess that I might know too, and somebody might know. you see, all of these things are combined in the same word. And somebody might know. And somebody might not-know. And I might know and I might not-know. But I am not going to make a what? Postulate. I am not going to make a postulate. So then therefore, we get the current scientific fad as being the fad of irresponsibility. And we look across the vast vista of confusion which science is calling itself right now – the dog's breakfast it's made out of civilization – and what do we find? What do we find? And we find out that their irresponsibility is very definitely being reflected.

There were just two or three guys left at the end of World War II who would uphold and try to continue responsibility for scientific creations. And the government got to them. Actually, there were sixty-four of them, and the government – US Government – shot them all down in flames. Oppenheimer, Condon, you can go off and list the whole list of them. They were found to be insecure. Well, those birds might occasionally have been talking with the divine doubt because it was the literary fad of the day. But nevertheless, those guys were pretty sure that you had to continue responsibility for your creations, and they were upset that they hadn't.

Nowadays, you get somebody, some working stiff scientist and so on, and the government says, "Put a fire engine in the beauty salon," and he does. You know. I mean, it doesn't matter to him, you know. you know. Make a weapon which will spread diphtheria only amongst children one and one-half years of age, you see. Some mad screaming general,

you know. He's utterly *"Thuh, thuh, thuh,"* and he tells this fellow, and the fellow says, "Well, that's what I must do," you see. And when they get into a devout doubt, why, they are of course, then ruled by insanity.

Devout doubts can always be ruled by insanity. You get the doubt being ruled by the insane, because doubting and insane are practically synonymous. Doubting expresses the inability to find out. The fellow says, "I doubt it." Somebody says, "It's going to rain today," and the other fellow says, "I doubt it."

He doesn't say, "It is not going to rain." He doesn't say, "It is going to rain," you see. He's put himself on the hedge between Know and Not-Know, and this is pretty late on the postulate line. Because of the existence of this thing, which I am studying right now – pretended knowingness – I'm not quite sure where it goes on this Know-Not-Know Scale. But it's probably late, probably late on the scale. Probably after the guy has doubted himself round the bend or something like this, why, then he'll pretend knowledge of some totally fallacious line – as you find most sciences doing today.

For instance, the science of marine propulsion. they think they got it taped. They think that a proper thing is this, and it's that, and it's the other thing. And you're supposed to do this and that, and engines should be so and-so.   They take atomic engines, and they take an 1860 steam engine, and they put an atomic boiler in it. And then they tell everybody they know what they're doing. No, they don't know what they're doing. They don't know anything about propulsion. You see, they've neglected the whole sphere and field.

They'll go over into pretended knowingness. Next thing you know you're going to get pronunciamentos, and you already have had them from leading scientists concerning the deity. And I – let me point out – I haven't been introducing you to any gods, large ones, small ones, green ones or pink ones. I haven't even been introducing you to the doubt of the situation. I don't think there's any doubt in your mind concerning my attitude toward this idea of deity. I think you're fairly sure that I think it's for the birds. But nevertheless, you're going to get a pomposity going here, and you'll get – a scientific religion will be the next one around the corner. This will be a real one. This will be a *wowzy* one. Space opera societies usually go in this direction one or the other. Religion is where you find that sort of a thing. But finding it in a test tube is really marvelous.

And there'll be some vast, pretended knowingness arise out of this. It's quite interesting. It's quite interesting, this whole field. I do want to say something here about this particular knowingness scale. Of course, it goes, as you know. Native state. Not-Know. See, native state – potential knowingness. And then it goes number one, Not-Know; number two, Know; number three, of course, is Forget; number four is Remember. Now we know exactly where we are up to there.

Now, we go down, and it'd be the – the factuals would be the even numbers. You know, I mean the grasping of the fact and so forth. That would be the even numbers. And the dismissal or not-ising of the facts would, of course, be odd numbers as you went on down and completed the rest of the scale. But it gets so mishmashy after a while that you're not quite sure whether they're doing which or what, and it's probably – doubt is down there somewhere or another, and it would have to be probably two numbers of the scale. You see, because it's neither Know nor Not-Know, or Forget or Remember or anything else. It's a hang-up between the two. It's the stuff that's gone into a ball.

But then, from doubt, we get a total avoidance. A total avoidance of factualness and get into pretended knowingness. See, the guy not only will pretend the knowingness but he'll also pretend the facts that back up the knowingness.

One of the things which you have to safeguard yourself against all the time in research. There's no pretended knowingness in there. Somebody's overtly making a pretence of having known something, and he has written down as having observed it, like there – oh we saw eighteen monsters in Loch Ness or something of this sort, you see. And then, therefore, we base a whole science on this, and we develop a whole science called "Sea Monsters: Their Habitats and Behaviors."

But this is quite important to an auditor. And actually, by the way, it is important to a pc. As he unravels his bank, he runs back up this scale, and somewhere along the line, if on some subjects – as of course, inevitably any reactive mind is – he runs up through doubt. And when he hits this doubt, then of course he doubts everything, and one of the rough things to do is he would go across that barrier. If he were going across it so hare that it pervaded his entire existence, of course, he also would be brought into a point of doubting Scientology, of doubting auditing, of doubting everything that's going on, and would stop sessions.

And, of course, he's in the fellow who is walking across the middle of the chasm, and he's right there in the middle of the chasm, you see. He isn't on an even numbered postulate or an odd numbered one, and he has been left exactly nowhere. And he goes off into a sort of a fog about the whole thing. And you can expect a pc who has had a rough time or is being audited on a rather low scale terminal, either way, to come up through these bands. And you really don't want to pay too much attention to a pc when he says well, he doesn't think Scientology works, you know. Two weeks ago it healed a broken leg for him or something like this, but it doesn't work, you see, and he doesn't know whether it's true, and so forth. Don't pay too much attention to that sort of thing. Recognize it for what it is.

Now, probably he had a pretended knowingness on some subject. And then when he moved off this pretended knowingness, he moved up scale. He is inevitably going to go past doubt. He doubts something else.

A medical doctor is pretending to know something about healing. We don't doubt that a medical doctor knows something about the mechanics of the body. We don't doubt that he knows something about the mechanics of the endocrines and functional systems of the body. They fought that up the hard way. Like plumbers know about pipes, they know about bodies. And pretty good in this particular line. A lot of them are very clever. They get somebody on the operating table gasping under the ether, and they can tie bowlines on the bight and double carrick bends in their intestines and fallopian tubes, and things like this. And they're neat. And some of their obstetrical activities, the better ones – the more impatient ones don't have this skill – but some of the better ones in their obstetrical activities are actually very clever with their hands, very clever with their knowledge about all of this. There are very few of these fellows.

Now you lower the boom on this fellow, and his pretended field of knowingness is healing. He pretends to know what will make the body well. Of course he's always missing on this. He's always missing because he says structure, of course, monitors function, so he can't help but miss because he's got it exactly backwards. He says he fixes up somebody's broken leg, you'll make him happy, you see. Or he fixes up somebody's broken leg, he'll walk. If he just sets the leg right, you see, and it's all neat, then the guy will walk again. Well, it happens, and it happens, and he keeps seeing this happen, and then one day the fellow doesn't walk. Well, then he gets curious and he'll repeat the operation, you see. And they rebreak the leg and they go in there, and they look at all the nerve fibers, and so on. And then they put it all together again, and neat it all up, and when it comes out of the cast again they say, "Walk, you bum." And the guy doesn't walk. And they say look, perfectly all right. The muscles are all right. The leg is all right. The nerve sensors are all right. The guides are all right. Everything is apparently all right, but the guy won't walk.

He never admits to himself that he really doesn't know what the score is until he's had quite a few of these. And then all of a sudden he either goes in two directions. He says there's something called religion. Qs-and-As with another sphere of pretended knowingness – how many angels can stand on the head of a pin, that sort of a thing, you know. Or he says there must be something to the mind. And by the mind he means the brain. And there must be something to the mind. And the mind must have something to do with all this, by which he means the brain. And then without any proof at all that the mind has anything to do about it, he invents a whole science. They've invented two or three of them since about 1894. And they haven't done anything with that either. That's another sphere of pretended knowingness.

So you start getting compartmented, built-up sciences which consist of pretended knowingness out here, see. Nobody's making a breakthrough. Now you invalidate these things by demonstration. You bring him back through. There's only one thing you can do is bring

him all the way through the band of doubt, because he's going to drive you half out of your mind, as an auditor, as you bring him up the line, because it's all going to shed off as doubt.

And the hallmark of the case is doubt. He isn't going to know whether he's in the auditing chair. He doubts whether you were doing it. He doubts, doubts, doubts, doubts, doubts, you see. He doubts whether it's working He doubts the result he got yesterday existed yesterday, although he thought yesterday it did exist, but today he doubts that yesterday existed. You get the idea.

So he comes up through all of these bands of doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, and he'll eventually come up topside to some kind of a certainty of his own observed certainty. But he has a longer way to go.

And you could say the more pretended knowingness which an individual has, the more doubt he'll encounter on his road out of it. you see, because he's got an awful lot of not-ised facts in there. See, he's got a lot of not-ised observations, you see, and he had to sort of shut his eyes to get into that kind of a pretended knowingness, you know. He's led some kind of a life, like his mother beat him every day, and wouldn't let him have anything to eat, and ran down the old man to him, and made sure the old man was a drunkard, and he's got a fixed datum: "Mothers are angels." See? And his existing observation in this particular lifetime is – just totally violates this basic postulate – "Mothers are angels," you know.

And it's the most pathetic thing, and I've seen this happen with both children and adults, you know: "Well, my mother was just an angel. She was just a darling She was nice to everybody." And you get into this, and you say what is this other character that is rushing around in this fellow's case, you see.

And then they'll go the reverse. And they'll have the idea that all women are no good. Stable datum, you see: All women are no good, particularly mothers. Mothers are no good. So all right, you look around all over this case one side of it, up side of it, down side of it, examine it, turn it over. you cannot find a single incident where his mother did anything to him, you know, but try to treat him decently and bring him up. He's gotten this datum in a long, backtrack lifetime, sometime or another, you see, and he's just clung onto it as a datum.

So, this guy is in a real fog because his experiential track leading up to this lifetime now does not permit him to predict anything in this lifetime. Nothing in this lifetime is predictable, so he's in a chronic state of nowhere. Now he will eventually go over this boundary because he doesn't like to be nowhere, and get himself a pretended somewhere. A thetan does this with the greatest of ease – pretends he is somewhere. This is very comical.

You know, the whole source of a dream is an effort to orient. There is nothing else to a dream. Take my word for it. Someday you'll get a good subjective reality on this thing. A dream does not forecast. A dream doesn't do anything else except tries to orient.

The fellow is asleep in a skull and some squishy stuff and the body is insensitive and insensible, and he hasn't got his communication lines out, so he can't feel the bed, and he can't perceive anything. He wakes up neglecting to get the body awakened, you see, and he is suddenly terrified it being no place. There's just a little flick there, you see. And he's just a little bit terrified of being nowhere, so he immediately creates himself a lot of somewhere. And he'll create himself one of the wildest somewheres you ever saw in your life sometimes. He gets Washington, DC all mixed up with London, you know. And then this is somehow or another in the South Seas, and so on. But it's a frantic effort to orient. Just to locate himself so that he can feel secure. That's what a dream is, and a dream, of course, is pretended knowingness because he is in none of these places. If you try to run out somebody's dream, you'll go through a band of doubt.

He doubts he dreamt it. That is one of the first things you run into as you start to erase a dream. He'll doubt this. He'll doubt that. Well, he's not sure – he's not sure of what time of the night it was. He's not sure of this. He's not sure of that. you get the idea? Well, what he's really hitting at, he was not sure where he was.

If you have somebody who has chronic nightmares, you can actually cure their chronic nightmares by getting them to orient themselves consistently, something like TR 10, something like this. Any orienting havingness process will cure nightmares. Interesting. After you've run it for a little while, and run it a bit flat, and got the guy a little bit more oriented, he won't have nightmares anymore.

The other way of handling nightmares is to give somebody B1. Guy's having a lot of nightmares, give him B1. Evidently, B1 molecules have compasses in them.

But now, when we're talking about things like this, of course, I'm just talking to you about practical observation, the practical observation, that's all. A guy who's having trouble with nightmares, I found out what it was, or I was having nightmares and got an orientation slant on it, and looked around and examined it someplace else and tried to find out if this was the fact of the case of the nightmare. Yeah, this is the fact of the case of the nightmare. All right. That compares with the observation, so to that degree it is knowingness. Simple.

We have a very simple rationale. It's much too simple for modern science. We don't have all the frills of modern science. All of the conventionals. And these conventionals are so darned unwieldy that it's a wonder they ever get anyplace. You know, you're supposed to make a record of everything you do in modern science. Well, that's the most wonderful way of slowing somebody down I ever heard of. Just think of what I would have done, or the research I would not have gotten done, if I had made a complete and detailed record of every observation and every action that I had observed that led to any type of a conclusion, since when you're handling something on the order and zone and width and dimension and height of life, you, of course, do nothing but observe.

Now, if you observed only for the record, and then if you filed the records and then took only the conclusions which the records gave you, you of course would have made a job which would have lasted over five or six hundred lifetimes. So, of course, the job couldn't have been done. And yet we do have quite a lot of records of one kind or another, but we don't have a large impractical record. Someday somebody's going to curse me for not having done this.

That I'm sure of. They'll curse me for it. But then that's a kind of pretended knowingness too, you know. you know things because you have 8,692 million Library cases full of paper. That's not true. you don't, you know. That's the Ford Foundation's motto. "We know as much as we have filing cases full of paper." And it never occurs to them we can do as much as we have filing cases full of paper. That doesn't follow, does it?

So you had to have, in order to accomplish the job at all, a method of shorthanding recording, and at summarizing observation, to get out of this slough of pretended knowingness. Otherwise, we would have wound up pretending we knew a lot of things we didn't know just because they were written down on paper. Quite interesting, but the insane asylum records on cases Jive you inevitably and invariably the full engram the person is stuck in, word for word, line for line. Examine them sometime. It's fantastic.

How could these fellows actually have been sitting around recording this Long without having come to this interesting conclusion that they were recording something There must have been something there for them to record. You know? They never looked for anything there. They never looked for anything to be recorded, you see, in the patient. They just observed the patient and made a record of what the patient was doing And then never found out that it was consistent or continual or repetitive, and never assumed that it must be coming from somewhere, and never tried to ask any patient where it was coming from or how they got that idea or anything else. And yet the records of insane asylums are full of the engrams in which their patients are stuck. You can actually pick up a lot of insane asylum records, go in to the patient it refers to and get them to run the exact engram that is on the records, and the person will run on through it and be in another dramatization quicker than scat.

And then of course, you've changed the case all over the place so this becomes quite startling and everybody goes into awe and propitiation. I've lone this a few times. That is why psychiatrists only have one thing against me, personally, is I'm trying to show other people how to handle the mind. And this is a betrayal. They have no slightest doubt in their own mind but what I know all about the mind. They think I'm a pretty able boy. But they sure hate this idea of developing competition. And it's just results of doing things like this, you know, of looking for pretended knowingness.

So there can be knowingness which is not observed knowingness, and that hangs around in that band someplace. You see, that's also got to be oriented on the track. You keep

observing this woman drinking Haig & Haig, and she drinks it in the morning when she gets up, and she drinks it for lunch, and she drinks it for supper, and she never draws a sober breath, and you never file the fact that she is a drunkard. This is omitted from the knowingness. Get the idea? We never say, well, this woman is a drunkard. We're liable to say, well, she has trouble with her husband. That has nothing to do with it. It has nothing to do with the observation. We may or may not have observed that she had trouble with her husband.

So you get then also a lot of devious observations of knowingness. Motorcycle breaks down. We take a look at the motorcycle. We say, well, the owner doesn't live right. It's not what we're observing. Don't you see? So it's a misobservation. That the owner lived right or didn't live right or that the owner s messed up mentally or not messed up mentally has nothing to do with the immediate observation that the motorcycle is broken down. you see? And as a matter of fact, the owner might be in very good condition but just bought it from somebody else, and our observation would be for the birds. The worst this would say is that the owner is a careless purchaser. Or it might say that motorcycles are scarce, and it might say a lot of other things but it's a nonobserved datum that is recorded. In other words, one looks at the evidence and then records something he didn't observe. And you'll see this in auditing.

A person will run an engram and then tell you something as pc that he hasn't seen in the engram. Very often it adds up to you as, it isn't a cognition, but it's a type of cognition. It's a very low order of cognition. He runs this engram through, and somebody's being beaten up, and he all of a sudden announces all lumberjacks wear boots, you see, but there aren't any lumberjacks in the engram. And you wonder what the hell all this came from. Where did we find this one?

Well, now you're introducing via knowingness, you know, or guessing by evidence. There's something else. There's so many stratas of this I – all I'm trying to do is show you there are so darn many stratas of this that I'm a little bit chary of putting them all down on the Prehav Scale because it's its own scale. But some of them are going to appear on the Prehav Scale. Probably Doubt should be on the Prehav Scale and Pretended Knowingness probably should be on the Prehav Scale. Guess should be on the Prehav Scale. There are quite a few of these should be, but I don't have the whole Knowingness Scale yet. I only got a few steps of it. I'll have it all taped one of these days.

Okay. Enough of that. Anybody got any more questions that won't lead to so much randomity on knowingness.

Female voice: Yes, I have. I think I've missed some data here. When running Goals Assessment by a repeater technique, I think one should put an acknowledgment after each repetition. Am I correct?

Mmm-hm. Always, whether the pc said anything or not.

Female voice: Mistake then. I didn't.

Ahh, well, that would slow you down.

Female voice: Mm-hmm.

You say "To fly to the moon." Pc doesn't say a word. you say, "Thank you."

Female voice: Mmm.

"To fly to the moon. Thank you. To fly to the moon. Thank you. All right. That's all of that. Okay. Now, here's the next one. To run steam engines. Thank you. To run steam engines. Thank you. To run steam engines. Thank you." This one is disappearing, so we say, "To run steam engines. Thank you. To run steam engines. Thank you. To run steam engines. Thank you." Okay. We cross it out, and we say, "All right, here's the next one." And so on. The pc hasn't said anything this whole time. Pc can sit there in the finest, most gorgeous state of irresponsibility you ever heard of and still have a Goals Assessment work like mad. He doesn't even have to have his mind on the goals you're reading, actually. It's a communication straight between the auditor and the reactive bank. Bang! Bang!

So, thank you for bringing up the point, Madge. There's always an acknowledgment every time you read a goal or a terminal.

Female voice: Okay. Another question on that . . .

That isn't true of the Prehav Scale. Assessment on the Prehav Scale, you don't. You say "TR 10." Is that it, Madge?

Female voice: No. The other question was, when it was nulled out, is it all right to say to the pc, "Well, that's out?"

I don't care what you say.

Female voice: Okay. Thanks.

It all depends on how good the communication is. The pc is liable to start getting very restive. I'm liable to ask him something, "Is it all right that that one went?" And he says, "Well, no, really, because that was my favorite goal." and you say, "Well, what was your favorite goal?" And he said, "Well, it wasn't exactly that." And we got another goal out of him. Any other questions?

Male voice: Did I understand, Ron, that you said that we don't acknowledge on assessing on the Prehav?

You understand right when I said you don't acknowledge on assessing on the Prehav Scale. You just fire, and you just go right on down the line, *Packety-rackety-rackety-rackety-*

rackety-rack. The proper assessment on a Prehav Scale I'll review for you. you simply – you – let's say you're assessing generally, you simply read the levels, and you start at number sixty-four, and you carry right on straight up the scale; and you make a dot or some such mark at every reaction you get, reading each level just once. Now having arrived at somewhere toward the top of the scale, you turn around then and you start down the scale, and because you start down the scale, you don't go down the whole scale, you only go down those that have – you have put a dot after.

And when these react on one reading again, you put a second dot. And now you'll find out that you normally wind up with two or three with two dots. So now you read the two or three with the two dots up, and then you read them down, and you'll be left with one with three dots. And it's a very rapid action, but there's no acknowledgment done. There's nothing said at all.

If you're assessing with a terminal, you announce the terminal each time, and if you're very clever, you'll flip-flop it. In other words, it will be the terminal doing something to you, you see. you doing something to the terminal, for the next line. For the next level, the terminal's doing something to you, and the next line, why, it's you doing something to the terminal. You get the idea? It's just to keep the flow from sticking on the assessment. One way – one way, and one way the next level. It doesn't matter which.

Because you've always got one run out of it. And you're trying to solve the problem of too much outflow. And the problem you're trying to solve, is you don't want the pc to sit there on the whole Prehav Scale from beginning to top, outflowing toward the terminal. Nor do you want the pc to be sitting there with the terminal outflowing toward the pc. So you just keep the flow going by doing a flip-flop up the line. Pc to the terminal. Terminal to the pc. Again, no acknowledgment. Nothing. Just read it one time each. Bang! Bang! Bang! Bang! Very simple operation. It's almost so simple that you could overlook it very easily. But, no acknowledgment is necessary. Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

Right. Any other questions? Yes.

Male voice: I have one that's not concerning the kind of rundown – it's this: That you laid a lot of stress on Presession 1 at one time, and then all of a sudden there it was gone, and we're not using Presession 1 now. can you clarify this, or the difference how the pcs go into session now?

All right. We had a lot of emphasis on Presession – Presession 1?

Male voice: Yes.

Oh. Way back. And then we didn't do Presession 1, and now your question exactly is?

Male voice: Well, we – at one time you said that it – or said words to the effect, I think, that it wasn't possible to get a pc into session until they had a free needle on help and control and communication.

Hmmm. Well, that is degree of "in-session." You understand? There are degrees of going into session. And that would be a pc fully in-session. I'm not trying to worm out of this. I m trying to show you something here. you've got another problem involved here. And it's a good thing to call this to attention. You get raw meat straight off the street, and you don't clear up any part of Presession 1, or you don't attack the opening guns with anything like Presession 1, and he's usually in a fog because he's stuck on all of these buttons.

It doesn't take too long to orient this sort of thing. Now, this is all under the heading of HGC stuff of taking a raw pc who has never had any auditing before and getting that pc into session. Now, as the pc comes into session, you'll find out it will be because he has a freer attitude toward these various things. Actually, two-way comm on them, discussion with them, that sort of thing, tends to get the pc much closer to being in-session. But something else has happened since, something else has happened.

We have cracked a fast way to get a pc into session. And the fastest way in the world to get a pc into session known to man or beast is Routine 3. The person who is not interested and who becomes unwilling to talk, well, Routine 3 – I mean it takes it. The fellow will talk about his goals. The fellow is interested in his goals. He then is interested in his own case, which is definition of "in-sessionness."

He'll jump over all of these earlier concerns. Don't you see? He just goes right over the top of these things and he's off to the races. Now, you've got another part of Routine 3, which is the – you're actually hitting at why we're using this type of approach now. Routine 3 also includes a Security Check. And this makes the fellow – this solves all the reasons he is not talking to the auditor. So Routine 3 contains those two elements, which keep a pc most from being in-session – which is, of course, interest in own case and willingness to talk to the auditor. Security Check handles willingness to talk to the auditor, and of course the Goals Assessment handles interest in own case.

And it's overwhelming if you're doing at all a smooth, technical job, that in fact it is nearly impossible to get a pc out of session.

Male voice: Yes.

And that is why you see so little emphasis these days on Presession 1. Does that answer the question?

Male voice: Yes, it does. Thank you.

You bet. Technology has handled the problem even more aptly. Okay?

Male voice: Yep.

Right. Okay? Any more questions? Yes.

Female voice: Can one ask the preclear a questions – the two questions of in-sessionness? Whether he's willing to talk to the auditor or whether he's interested in his own case?

Ummmm.

Female voice: on the meter. . .

I wouldn't say offhand that it was a very good approach because it's liable to sound accusative to a Scientologist. I'd say – I'd say – it's a good thing you bring this up. I'd say no. one shouldn't do this. We shouldn't want to ask the pc if he's interested in his own case and is willing to talk to the auditor. You can, of course, always ask somebody, "Are you willing to talk to me?" and clear it on the needle. It's perfectly valid. But "Are you interested in your own case?" No, I'd omit that. So one of them is quite valid, and the other is quite invalid.

Female voice: I was just wondering about the needle read . . .

Mmm.

Female voice: ..."not interested," what the needle would read. Would probably be a drop: "not interested."

No. Now listen, honey, you're assessing the Prehav Scale at the level of Interest, and that's all you'd get a reaction on. If the fellow was sitting on Interest as a hot button, you'd get a response. And if he wasn't sitting on Interest, you wouldn't get any response. And after you ask the question, you would know exactly nothing. That's why. you got it?

Female voice: Right.

Now, don't you feel bad about asking a question. Perfectly all right. Okay. Any other question?

Male voice: Yes.

Yes.

Male voice: In Terminals Assessment, would you keep on repeating these terminals that sends the pc into whole track and gets them a bit mucked up? Do you stop to do anything about it or do you press through on the assessment?

All right, if you're doing a Terminals Assessment and you keep repeating the terminal and the pc goes through into whole track and gets a bit mucked up, why, do you do anything about it or continue with the assessment? And the answer to that is a very difficult one to

make because it's a matter of an adjudicative sort of thing which is not actually based on anything but giving you a guide.

Because a pc being assessed is a pc being assessed. And it is that pc that's being assessed. And you take pc one and you start taking up anything he's going into on the whole track one way or the other, and he has gone up to the seventy-five-foot high-dive tower and in he goes, and this is a wonderful opportunity to just never get anywhere, don't you see? He's just got brakes on from there on out. So, if you do it, if you start taking it up with this particular pc, why, you're in trouble from there on out.

Another pc, he accidentally gets into something of the sort on one terminal. Repeater Technique is nothing to be running this one terminal on, particularly, and he's going down track and up track, and it's not something that is happening chronically, something like that. you decide, well, I better do something about this, so you take it up with two-way comm or something like this, and you pull a little bit of the charge off the thing. The best thing to do that with would be Not-Know or Forget or something like that.

The guy started charging backtrack, you say, "Dentist. Dentist. Dentist. Dentist." And then he's going *bzzz,* and he's backtrack. *Bzzz bzzz,* and he's backtrack. *Bzzz bzzz.* And then you say, "Dentist. Dentist." And it's getting hotter and hotter and hotter. Well, in the first place, let's ask this question: What are you doing repeating a terminal too many times, that is getting hotter and hotter? See? There would be mistake one. This is how you can keep out of that kind of trouble and not have to confront this problem.

Why worry about it? In the first place, if you just read a terminal without any bric-a-brac, just read a level – just read a terminal three times to a person, and it is still reacting on the needle, it's not going to erase, that's for sure, without some ardure. So, the best program is to leave it alone. Don't score it out. Skip it. In other words, you take terminals off in layers. You don't take them off by the terminal. You take them off in classes of terminal. You got the idea? You finish up reading a whole list of terminals, and you're left there with fifty percent of the terminals still alive. I'd say that was pretty good. Seventy-five percent of the terminals still alive. You only got rid of twenty-five percent of the terminals on the whole list. I'd say that was pretty good. But remember you would have done it very rapidly.

Now you go back over it again. You go back over the remaining seventy-five percent, and you'll find out that only ten of them disappear on this read. And then you go back over it again, this whole list which is now getting to be a minor list indeed. It's only got thirty on it, or something like this. And you go over this list, and all of a sudden they all scrub. You watch this phenomenon. You practically just read them once, and they're gone, except one. And boy, that's good and solid. You apparently have got something there.

So we ask him for some more terminals, and the second we've got more terminals, we go back over them, and we pick up this one that was red-hot, and we all of a sudden find out it's flatter than a flounder. We read it once, it's gone.

And I would say the only way that a person would get too messed up on the whole track – the only way that this could occur or would occur, is where the auditor is trying to scrub terminals that aren't going to scrub very easily. And that you shouldn't be so arduously trying to scrub terminals, and I'd say that if you had this rule – it's just a rule of the thumb, you know – you read the thing three times and it's still alive, leave it. That's a light look, but after you've read it three times, on the third time it didn't react – you know, one, two, three, third time it didn't react – go ahead and scrub it. Read it four or five more times, and it'll scrub. But after you've read it four or five more times and it's still get – it still seems to be very alive, don't get hectic about erasing it. Just leave it. you made a mistake.

But you should be able to adjudicate on the first three reads of a goal or a terminal, whether or not that thing is going to go or remain. And if you get very good at it, you will be able to make that adjudication in the first three reads, and if it's there, it's there. Don't feel defeated because it's still there. That's fine. So it's still there. But if you are trying to erase a terminal or a goal, which after three reads looked like it was going to stay there, and you now read it twelve more times, and it's still going to stay there, but it seems to be less. So you press on and read it eight or nine or ten more times, and now it disappears, you're liable to find the fellow has been pressed onto the whole track. You get how this would happen?

He'll only go on the whole track with terminals or goals which are extremely alive and are usually interdependent on other terminals, classes and goals, you see. So if you want to keep your pc off the whole track – not that that is vital either – but if you want to keep him off the whole track in a Goals or Terminals Assessment, why, you'll follow this three read rule.

You know, it looks like it's going to stay after three reads. Well, let it stay. Looks like it's going to go after three reads, well, take four or five more and see if it's going to disappear. And if you follow that, you'll get very minimal whole track proposition.

Now a pc that is having trouble going up and down the whole track is probably being assessed out of PT with the rudiments out. A person will more greatly tend to go onto the whole track if the rudiments are out than if the rudiments are in. So I'd say if the pc was plunging around, I wouldn't take up these things that put him on the whole track. I would leave them alone, very severely, and I would move off at once of my assessment. I would end the session with end rudiments. I would start another session with beginning rudiments with a break between. And now I would proceed along the line of read them lightly. If they look like they're still going to be there, leave them. That is the way I would handle that situation.

It is very true that a person can be plowed all over the track, all over the track with goals, reads, and repeater, and that sort of thing, but ordinarily it is done with the rudiments out, and they'll go all over the track, or one is trying to erase things that are trying to stay. And one is in a kind of a games condition with the pc.

He's saying, "Well, here's a goal."

And you say, "No. You haven't got that goal," you see. And that kind of a games condition develops, of course he's going to go all over the whole track.

I would say that rudiments – the cure for that is get the rudiments in, and read them more lightly, and be quicker. Be very quick on adjudication as to whether they're going to stay in or go. After all, you're trying to find the fellow's goal rather than get rid of the fellow's goals. You're trying to find a goal that is all up and down the thing.

Now at the same time, this must go along with a Goals Assessment, since a Goals Assessment itself is not just a pre-therapy action, but is an action which is right part and parcel of auditing. It is auditing.

So the individual gets into some kind of a goal area that needs considerable discussion, needs considerable elucidation or something of this sort. And he's into some kind of a snarled up package of goals one way or the other, and he can't make head nor tail out of it. I would just patiently have him list all the goals he could think of out of there and use a lot of Not-Know in trying to get the patches of goals out of there. I'd settle right down in the middle of the list to get some more goals out of this thing if he's so snarled up. you get the idea?

He says – oh, I'll give you an example. He says, "Well," he says, "I want to burn down the town," he said. This has obviously been a goal of longstanding – burning down a town. "And I want to burn down this town. I want to burn down this tow ." But that's just really not the goal. It's quite an ordinary situation in Goals Assessment. "Well," he says, "it's really not the goal. It's really not burning down a town."

Well, now if you want to take it the long, arduous, involved, and upsetting way, if you want to take it the long way and the wrong way, go into towns he has burned down. See, this is the wrong way to.

Now, the right way to take it up is to find out how many other goals are buried in that immediate vicinity. And you'd run a Not-Know on the situation, you see.

"Well, could there be any goals you have forgotten like that?"

And he'd think it over and all of a sudden, why, two or three more goals pop up, and suddenly this thing will clarify for him. And he'll say, "Well, it's not to burn down a town. It's to singe people. Come to think about it, when I was a little boy, yeah, that's right. Ohhhh ohhhh ohh, wait a minute, man." You know. "I was always throwing firecrackers under

people's feet and sticking burning matches, and so forth, around them and yeah, it's to singe people. That was the goal."

Yeah, now he's happy about the whole thing, and you go on with your assessment. But you assist the pc to clarify his goals, not assist the pc to clarify his track. Best way to do it is Not-Know, Forget, other things of that character because obviously if he's mixed up, it's because he's forgotten something. Ergo. Does that answer your question, John?

Male voice: Yes, that does.

Okay. All right. Any other questions? Yes.

Female voice: Yes. I'd like to know what it is that happens to a goal that just seems to seep away. I can see what happens to a goal when it comes at the end of a chain you say, "Oh, well, that's it. That's fine. I get the whole picture now." But sometimes they just die on you.

Yeah. All right. Well, you want to know what happens to a goal that just dies. Well, actually, you move the fellow. It's the degree that you move him out – the velocity with which you move him out of the zone he had this goal.

First place, we have to take an anatomy of goals. A goal is a not-hereness. See, it's a not-hereness. It's a nonexistence state. This fellow's on this desert island, and he looks around, and he says, "I would really like to build this place up." Well, that's a mild one, you see.

Well, he's already expressed dissatisfaction with havingness. He's expressed the dissatisfaction of the desert island. He can't have the desert island, you see. This is probably why he was forced into this goal. He can have the desert island and decide to build it up, too. Well, that goal is not very upsetting on the track, believe me. There's nothing to that. That probably won't even come up.

But there's another one, see. That he's standing in the middle of this desert island he says, "The hell with this place," he says, "There's no water. There's no blondes. There's practically no modern conveniences of any character." And he says, "That's it." And he says, "I'm just going to have to build this place up." He says, "I've got to. I've got to build this place up because there's just nothing here, and there's nothing doing, and you couldn't live on it, and so on, so I got to." So he sweats himself half to death and he goes in a heroic cataclysms of one character or another, and he's got this big goal to build up this desert island, and here he goes, you see. And so help me Pete, you find a desert island sitting on the track.

Well, what takes him off of this desert island? Is the fact that he had a goal not to have a desert island, didn't he? He said, "I've got to build up this desert island." Now he's immediately got the obverse goal understood in it not to have a desert island. So of course,

he's stuck with a desert island. You see, he couldn't have the desert island by postulate. But he could have the other situation.

All right. You run into something like that, and you run into consistent goal of that type, and you get a whole chain of goals of this particular type, and you get this whole long line of can't-haves of great violence. Well, man, that will be one of these goals that – that's it!

Well, supposing he was just standing there and every time he got on a desert island he got into wars, you see, and that sort of thing, and he kept being shot down on desert islands and that sort of thing. And he says, "Oh, ho-hum." He said, "I will have to fix up the place a bit, you know." And he doesn't make much of a postulate not being able to have it. But this has been a consistent practice of his, you see. He's going to fix up this desert island. And the importance of it is not very great. You repeat it, it just seeps away. It's the relative importance of the goal and the relative importance of the goal is the relative can't-havingness of the goal.

In other words, all mass transfers from the existing environment to the goal, so the goal becomes mass, and the environment becomes no mass. Importance is mass. In thinkingness, when you say importance, you mean mass. Well, if there isn't much mass attached to this goal, and there isn't much can't-have on the mass he did have, why then, it'll just fritter away. There won't be very much charge on it. It'll just disappear.

But if the reverse is true, if the reverse is true, well, you get this: He could have the desert island. He thinks desert islands are fine, so he's going to fix it up. And you strike that, and you don't even get charge on it. There's not even enough charge on it to put it down.

Why isn't there enough charge on it? Because the individual could have what he was changing. Now, the reverse and the most charged goal is inevitably the degree of can't-have that he ran on his surroundings while formulating the goal.

He sees this marvelous army, and it's arrayed in battle array. And it is about to attack the army which he is heading, you see. And he sees this marvelous army, and he says, "That must cease and desist. We must triumph over the Franks. We must smash them. We must turn their country into a shambles and ruin. We must really wreck this outfit," he says, and then lays on Macduff and really wrecks the outfit, don't you see? Ka-wham, wham, wham. Don't be surprised in his next life if he becomes a Frank. Why? What happened?

Well, he couldn't *have,* he couldn't have the Franks. He couldn't have their army. He couldn't have any part of them, and yet this is a very violent, capable-of-motion, important unit. And so he's saying can't-have on a very important have, don't you see. And he runs can't-have with violence and therefore he can't have the property of the Franks or anything about the Franks and so forth, and his goal is then expressed to you, as to be Emperor of the French. You see, this is what he expresses it as – to be Emperor of the French. This is his goal. He decides this is the case.

Of course, that's a Johnny-come-lately goal. There's some earlier goal actually which amounts to this. To smash that whole, *con-blam,* cotton-picking army. The whole ruddy works, you see. And this is a failure. And then he walks up to a new failure. And he finally gets up on top of this thing, and he says, "Well, the only way I could have the French and so on because I can't have the French and uh. . ." There we go. you see. And he's all into confusion about it.

All right. You knock out the goal, and he – even for an instant, you see – perceives the havingness as a result of, you know – he's now not making the postulate of the can't-have. So all of a sudden he can have, so all of a sudden it blows. It's a very, very rapid mechanism. You hardly see the thing happen, it's so quick. And you're restoring havingness up and down the track like mad. And you get – you get this fellow – his goals are all can't-haves. His goals are all escapes that you register, but it isn't true that every goal he's ever had is an escape goal. See, all of his goals aren't based on can't-have. To some slight degree, the fact that he changes an environment, of course, deprives him of the old environment, but if this is not very important, you get no registry.

You get the conduct, by the way, of the West End kid. Just measure this up. Here's the West End kid in New York, you know. He's down around the docks, and he's – boy, he hates the tenement, he hates the drunken father, he hates the this, he hates the that, you see. And he hates the public school. And he doesn't want to do this, and he doesn't want that, and so on. And he has this tremendous goal to become a rich and powerful beer baron or something. That's the thing to be, you know, and here's this goal to be a beer baron, and the more beer baron he gets, why, the more he stinks of onions and flats.

And you get this boy after he's moved up in life. you say, well, anybody moving through various stratas of culture certainly will pick up some of the culture. How come the West End kid, notoriously by reputation, never picks up culture when he moves upstairs? Course he's got himself pinned in the tremendous can't-have of a culture which has overwhelmed him already. And he can't get rid of that culture.

And it doesn't matter how many yachts and butlers and anything else he gets as he goes on up the line, he winds up at the top stinking of onions. You got the idea? He's still got the environment because he couldn't have the environment.

All right. You audit him. And you run across the goal – he's got to be a beer baron. And all of a sudden something happens because simultaneous with it went "can't have the West End," you see. And that is the obverse, so it tends to blow. And he'll understand this.

Now a pc being audited on goals who isn't permitted to inspect this, every now and then, or who doesn't see any part of this or doesn't inspect any part of this, is going to make a slow freight.

Got something going on here that we can't quite put our finger on. So it must be that the goals are pretended goals or it must be the goals are just made up to satisfy you or he isn't telling you all of his goals, or there's something wrong with the Goals Assessment. There's something wrong there. There's something wrong with the type of goal he's giving you.

And of course, his can't-have on environments is so great, the goals themselves stand independent of and disassociated from the can't-haves. You got the idea?

The second he gets in the middle of a desert island, why, he wouldn't say I've got to build this place up. He wouldn't say, "I've got to get out of here. If I live through this, I'll have to own some Brown Derbys in Hollywood." You know. Now he's getting a little bit disassociated, see. He's on a desert island, and his goal on this desert island is not even to live through it, you see, but not to have it happen again, see. So his answer to that is to own a Brown Derby in Hollywood. And this is totally disrelated. How come? You run across this goal, it just doesn't make much sense. What does it go back to?

And your pc will also be rather bemused sometimes about this thing. And he says, "Well, to own a chain of Brown Derbys in Hollywood." He's on desert island, you know. This isn't Hollywood, see. When he says, "Brown Derbys in Hollywood," he expects to get a picture of Hollywood, you know, and funny looking, very gilded, polished-up drive-ins – which is all they are, actually. He expects that, you know, and he doesn't get that, he gets this desert island. And it leaves him in a "What the hell is this?" you know.

And your pc starts bugging on this sort of thing. Recognize you're looking on a disrelate. It's a disassociation. In other words, the can't-have is not associated with the goal. To become a great restaurateur. And he's in the middle of an island in the South Pacific. Well, you can connect that, you see.

But how about this? To sell fountain pens. And he gets a picture of a desert island. This doesn't make a bit of sense, see. It doesn't make any sense to him either. Because he doesn't remember this, and he can't even quite figure out how it was. And there's some devious methodology by which he has been on a desert island, and he couldn't write to anybody or he could have written to somebody, don't you see, if he had just had a bottle and some ink, you see, and he figures out this is his only method of getting out of this and can't-have the desert island, you see. And this is totally stopped because he can't figure out any way to make any ink, and he gets the idea, if I only had a fountain pen. The best way to have fountain pens, of course, in abundance, would be to sell fountain pens. And he goes kind of buggy, you see. And he says, "Well, I think I'd love to sell fountain pens." And he says, "Sell fountain pens," he gets a picture of a desert island. See, the can't-have of fountain pens is a desert island. And that doesn't make any sense to anybody.

So he gets pretty confused. Well, what is there, there? There's a not-know there, isn't there? There's not only a can't-have, but there's a big forgot, and a big Not-Know, and a big Disconnect, and something of that character. And you're totally within your rights to work over something like that. Just because a guy was cruising around on the track, I wouldn't try to help him out much. So he's cruising around on the track. It won't kill him. These conducted or nonconducted tours. Selling a season ticket to his own bank. Don't do anything drastic about that, but the bird's saying, "Sell fountain pens?"

"Yeah, well, I had a goal to sell fountain pens, all right. Yeah. I – I – I did. Yeah."

Well, if you're just sitting there grind, grind, grind and you don't understand the mechanism of what he's going through, you never ask him burning questions such as what desert island are you sitting on, you know. In other words, what are you looking at?

He appears to be quite mystified by his own goals. He's got a disassociate or he goes over into Pretended Knowingness, you know. He knows what his goals are, but they had nothing to do with anything. And you say, "What are you looking at?"

The guy says, "Well, I want to own the Brown Derby in Hollywood and start a whole chain of Brown Derbys."

You say, "What are you looking at?"

He says, "I'm looking at a desert island."

You say, "You remember when you had that goal?"

"No."

"Well, what's unknown about it?"

"Ha-ha-ha. Oh, well, I remember that. Yeah, was ha-ha-ha. Yeah. Yeah. I was on this desert island, see. And I all of a sudden realized there was no food in the joint. And about the best way you could have food, you know. And when I finally got out of this thing, I figured out well, that's it. Yeah. Hey! What do you know. Hey! That was some island."

Well, he's actually removed himself from the desert island, you see, forevermore. You can kick that just like that if you know these mechanisms. You can make the associate happen. And your long, arduous, apparently disassociated goals list that had stemmed from that particular source will, of course, all of a sudden connect and start blowing like mad, because you're making the guy connect. Now you can get down and make somebody connect any way you want to now that you've got Not-Know and Forget and so on.

What would be unknown about making that postulate? What would be unknown about having that goal? What would be unknown about such a goal? Where would one not want to be when one made that goal? That, of course, would be an unusable but a very involved

question, but a very factual one. Where would one not want to be when he made that goal? Or what would one not want to know about while he was making that goal? And that, of course, is a very workable one. What would one not want to know about while he was making that goal? And of course, the guy's bank is liable to do a 3D shift. And it's not all disrelated.

You know, there are people walking around all the time whose pictures don't associate with their existence? Of course, they're very baffled by this. Electronics engineer, wouldn't you know it, he's – was up in my office one day. I said, "What are you looking at?"

And the fellow says . . .

Well, I says, "Come on. What are you looking at? What are you looking at? Do you look at something all the time?"

"Well, yes."

"well, what!

"Well, it's a window."

"What window is it?"

"Well, it's just a window."

He had been sitting looking at this window for seven trillions of years. Place got atom bombed while he was standing there at the observation post. I ran him a little while on the responsibility for the window, and for the incident. I've told you about this before, and he actually went outside in his engrams, you see, and got in a car and got the full kinetic of a space car, you see, pulling up a hill and going over the top of the hill with the *hoomph! you* know. He got the full kinetic of it, you know. He's been just over the top of the hill ever since, sitting right there, but I didn't take it any further than that. But he's a man who was over the hill anyhow.

But now, that fellow, of course, must have been every now and then pretty mystified. What was he doing with a picture of this picture, you know? "What's this window? It must have some religious significance. Maybe it's the window of light. Yes. Maybe it's the window of the soul. Somebody says, 'The window of the soul.' you know. If he'd become a poet, he could have become allegorically lyrical, Miltonishly *blah* on the whole subject of the window. "Window, window, endure, endure. Prehav, Prehav, Prehav."

And you find him worshiping window or something of this sort. You'll find him never able to go by an arched window. So go bing! bing!

Well, now look. In order to have that stuck picture, he had to make a can't-have on the window. It was a can't-have there. And he had to have a goal there. And he had to say

something else, you see. He said an *I've got to be: I've got to be elsewhere* or *I've got to be A,* or *I've got to do forth.* And maybe there were a lot of them all occurring at that.

Now, instead of taking it apart with responsibility these days, I'd ask him about "What about the window had he forgotten, or might he forget or was forgettable about the window." And having asked him that a couple of times, I'd ask him "What else would one – what would one really want to be doing while one was looking at a window like that?" And probably the basic goals of this lifetime would have just come off *brrrrrrrr, you* see.

He must have made a whole lot of very, very tough postulates, and the whole environment overwhelmed him at the same time. And a whole lot of not-there sort of postulates, you know, of be elsewhere. And no as-is of this, and no acceptance of this in order to stick himself that thoroughly. It must have been a very complex situation, but expressed in terms of goals, he was postulating elsewhereness while being thereness. While thereness was occurring, he was postulating elsewhereness, you see. While he was in one being, probably he says, "Never again shall I be an officer of the Upper 3D Galactic Space Ranger Empire. This is it, man." And he expresses that by saying, "I think I'll be a janitor in my next life." See, his beingness is invalidated.

Possibly, you could romance as to what was behind this exact picture, but the very great possibility, which he didn't admit to, was the possibility he was actually, probably, responsible for safeguarding this particular zone, civilization, or area. you see. He was probably the boy who had said, "Well, now, I'm the boy who's supposed to safeguard all this and I'm taking care of it." And probably it was being done with a huge number of electronic mechanisms of some kind or another, you see, or something like that. And his postulates made then are carrying forward now. And he's in electronics, and he's trying to build a what? He doesn't know. So very often he feels very pointless, you know. He builds something and it goes into a little box and it makes a whistling sound, you see. And that's great, but that isn't it.

And everybody says, "But that is it. That unlocks the door, you see. I mean when you press this button, the whistle resonates, and it locks and unlocks the door, and it does it." "And *well-ell,* I don't know, I'm not satisfied with it," you know. And he gets a reputation as being a perfectionist. Actually, he's no perfectionist at all. He's a not-thereness case because that isn't what he had to invent to prevent the destruction of the city. See, he had to invent a gadget to prevent the destruction of the city, but he never formulated it. So he's still trying to formulate the gadget for the destruction of the city.

In other words, he's got a game going here, and the game is simply the formulation of gadgets which prevent the destruction of cities. And we run a can't-have on destruction of cities on other people by the formulation of gadgets. And you'll find out this'll slop over into his life. It regulates his whole life. It's just like he's in an Iron Maiden of "I-am-supposed-to's," you see.

He goes down the street and he finds that the people emptying the wastepaper – litter baskets, you see, they bang the cans back and very often dent them, you know. Or they bung up the sidewalk or something like this, and he feels very something or other about that, you know. He's quite emotional about it. He writes letters to the *times* and does all kinds of things. He's very upset about this. The preservation of these litter baskets and so on, you see. It's all just a tiny little gradient of the destruction of the city, don't you see.

And he's very preservative in this particular line. And he sees somebody tearing a building down to build a skyscraper, and he says, "Oh, no. No, no, no, no, no, no. That shouldn't be. Hm-mm. Hm-mm."

Shouldn't be. Somebody is moving a brick in this city, you see. That's the basic thing, is somebody is changing something slightly about this city that looks like it might possibly be a destruction. And he can't even analyze that it's a betterment of it, see. And he gets this instantaneous emotional response that he himself can't analyze. And it'll all be pinned up on that series of goals which are right there, looking at this window.

You see how the mechanism of Goals Processing works? If you understand the exact mechanism of why it works, you can make this thing fly. And nobody's going to tell you, you shouldn't make it fly, either.

There's ways of making Goals Processes fly like mad. you – pc says, "Well, have you got a – what goals have you had?"

"Well, I've had a goal to keep my job and wash my teeth every morning and – um – make a fair salary, and I've had a goal of being not too observed in life. And I've had a goal of, well, I've had a goal of just doing my job. And that's it. That's it. That's right. That's it."

"Well, do you have any more goals?"

"No, no. I told you, I told you. That's it."

Well, now from this point on, don't you see, you always get to this point with a pc whether or not he's given you a hundred and thirty or three. That point occurs when he's telling you that's it and there are no more. When you've just about at that point begun to knock on this door, see, of the E-Meter and you're saying, "Hey! Hey! Open up and show us the stuck picture, huh?" *Unh unh.* Be painful. The thing is an overwhelming situation.

Now if you led in on a gradient scale like this, and he gave you "to have a job" and so forth, and you say, "Good. All right." And you write it down.

And you got this list, and now you go back over the first one of these things "to have a job." And you say, "Well, all right. That's fine. All right. I'm going to read this goal to you. To have a job. To have a job. Well, what picture do you have?"

"Well," he says, "it's this big grainery. And there's these huge machines, and so on. Well, I've never seen that picture before much except it's there all the time."

"Well, that's fine. Let's see what this is all about." See.

But we can go on and say "To have a job, to have a job," and it disappears, and we say, "You got the picture now?"

"No."

We didn't learn anything more about it. We didn't have to. All right. And "To brush my teeth every morning," and you say, "To brush my teeth every morning. To brush my teeth every morning. To brush my teeth every morning." This thing is increasing. "All right. Let's go to the next one." And so forth. And we read that one off and we get that one erased. And we get back to this "brush my teeth every morning." We say, "To brush my teeth every morning." And it's increasing.

"What picture you got there?"

"Oh, it's a seascape."

This is pretty wild, isn't it? Brush his teeth – seascape. Well, at least there's water in both of them.

And you say, "Well, tell me some more about that picture."

"Well, there isn't anything more to tell you about the picture. It's just a seascape," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, is there anything you've forgotten about that picture? Anything you'd rather not-know about that picture? Anything you don't know about that picture?"

"Anything I don't know? There is everything I don't know about the picture. I don't know what sea it is. I don't know where it is. I don't know where it's located. I don't know anything connected with it, so forth. Don't know this. Don't know that. Don't know the other thing, and so on."

And you say, "Well now, what do you know about it?"

"Oh, well, I can tell you a little more about it now," and so forth.

And all of a sudden he says, "You know, that's funny, I'd forgotten all about that, but in World War II, I was a scuba diver. And we used to have to go in, you know, locate these mines and stuff under the water all the time. I was only on that duty a few months. Funny, I'd forgotten all about it, you know. And it's the taste of this god damned oil. This god damned oil, you know. I can taste it now." you know.

And you say, "Well, what do you think a fellow chewing on oil like that would think he ought to be doing?"

Well, he says, "He ought to be brushing his teeth every morning."

That's the end of that goal. see how you could knock them out? You could just knock them out by the count if they didn't go very easily or something of this sort.

And then you eventually will get onto a goal line on the bulk of cases which is "every time they're in a tight spot they say 'I should be a schoolteacher Doesn't matter what's happening to them. They're running a P-99 Interceptor, and they just shot down their hundred and fifteenth enemy plane, and at that moment the instrument panel disintegrates in front of them, and they say, "I should be a schoolteacher." You see.

Or they're a clerk, and they're selling bolt goods in a store, you know. And they keep selling these bolts goods and so forth, and people keep saying take down another one. Take down another one. And the whole store is at last nothing but bolts of cloth, all unstrung, and the lady says, "No, I just don't see what I want." And they say at that moment, inevitably, "I should be a schoolteacher." You see? And it's just the goal which, for some peculiar reason, it is so asinine, it doesn't connect with anything, and they never do become a schoolteacher except this lifetime. And now by accident they became a schoolteacher. And being a schoolteacher, of course, puts all of these things into restim.

And they're having a hell of a time in life, because, you see, they're shooting down their hundred and fifty-fifth aircraft with a P-99 Fighter and so forth. They're teaching the little kids, you know. say your A's, say your B's, say your C's – and guns are going off, here's the pilot, you know. And then they finally say, "Well, I guess I must be a nervous type." you see what's happening. God help somebody who has actually realized his chief goal on the whole track.

You see what – you see the words and music that would go on as he started to run it out. So that is what goals are all about. But you could actually sit there and take apart any goal that was sticking. You could take it apart similarly if you . . . You should investigate the mechanism, you should get a subjective and objective reality on some of these mechanisms and see exactly how they look to you. And you could play it by ear. you won't be sitting there slavishly, you know, saying "Well, Ron said read it three times, and I don't know why I'm reading it three times."

Of course, you're in a game situation too because you're sitting there reading it three times and you're liable to say to yourself, "Well, I wish I was a, a. . ." There goes your old games condition. You get into a games condition on the subject of a goals condition. And you see how easily that could happen?

So what you should do is observe. I'll tell you a fundamental auditor error. Do you want to hear the fundamental auditor error? A fundamental auditor error is to fail to discover what the pc is doing with the auditing command and what the pc is looking at. All summed up under what the pc is doing – subheads, observing, thinking, feeling, any other subhead you want – but all summed up under: What is the pc doing? What's the pc looking at? What's the pc involved with now? Does the pc all of a sudden run into a problem here? The pc's aspect changes, any way, better or worse and you don't find out about it – oh, what the hell! What are you doing? Flying on instruments in the fog and rain in northern England? What is this all about? Why should you do that? There's no point in it.

The pc's sitting there. Now the pc is supposed to be in communication with you, but how about you being in communication with the pc? See, that's the other side of the coin. And let me tell you, you'll fold up someday if you don't keep the other side of the coin bright.

Pc in communication with you. That's supposed to be in the rules, but how about you staying in communication with the pc? And that is all under the heading of "Just what's the pc doing?" You know? What's going on? What's cooking, good looking, you know. That sort of a thing, you know. What's happening here? And you should make it a point, even though it makes your auditing terribly arduous and is very clumsy at first and seems to extend it out ad nauseam and puts hours on a result length from your viewpoint, you know.

It wouldn't matter. This wouldn't matter. Just every time the pc does something different or every time the tone arm goes to a new high or a new low, you know. Not each time it flicks, between, you know – while it's rising. But it finally gets up to 4. It's been going from 3.25 on up, and it gets up to 4. And it seems to be hanging there at 4. Say, "Whatcha doing?" You know? "What's happening?" You know? It means something. Pc twitches. Pc does something else. Pc coughs, sneezes, seems to get his eyes watering.

Change has occurred. Investigate the points of change. No change is occurring. Investigate the points of no change. Find out what the pc is doing. And the pc very seldom resents this. It's a primary failure in auditing. Has been the primary failure since 1950. It's a failure to discover what the pc is doing. What's going on? Now when I tell you that every time you've got a goal that was sticky on the pc, the pc had a picture, how many of you have asked and found this out as a personal observation. And how many of you have found out that it's always a disrelated picture. If it's really stuck, it's quite disrelated.

Brush your teeth; he's got a seascape. Got the idea? Every time you say brush your teeth, he's got a seascape. What's this? Your curiosity should be aroused about that point; you should find out why. It's an interesting thing.

Now, wrong thing to do is go chasing all over the bank and chasing seascapes all over the bank, and trying to run engrams all over the bank, and that sort of thing while doing a

Goals Assessment, and just restimulating everything in sight, and so forth. That's not what I'm asking you to do. I'm just asking you to find out what's there and get the pc to look at what's there. Because the more you make a pc look, the more the pc's going to as-is, and the more the pc's going to understand. And that's for sure. That's a cardinal law.

And the auditor who won't make a pc look, the auditor who is not himself curious about what's going on with the pc, presents to the pc an attitude of disinterest. And if you feel your auditor is disinterested, just attribute it to one thing: He's probably just going over the methods by rule of thumb, and he's not asking you what you're doing.

Now on the auditor's side of it, you would present the same aspect, if you never asked. And the way to present an interested face is just be snoopy. The way to convince a pc that you're terribly interested is not protest and demonstrate you're doing your job right and all of this sort of thing. That is not the way to go about it.

The way to go about it is simply to be snoopy. What are you doing? What are you looking at? What's been happening? You get the idea? And you get some kind of a brief answer, and it doesn't seem to be leading anyplace. And it doesn't mean very much. Well, you say, "All right, all right, all right." And you're liable to find out that this is the reason ARC breaks are being caused with the pc, is you're just not being snoopy enough.

Now, that's a hard thing to teach to people who have been educated into 'the invasion of privacy is bad." But in this particular case, the invasion of privacy is absolutely necessary. You've got to find out what's going on. The pc's eyes go shut on you. The pc's been sitting there brightly alert, and all of a sudden goes *blooong,* and so forth. Well, the second it happens, don't jump him. Don't be so quivery. Look at him for a command or two. Now say, "Now, what's going on?" The pc's surprised enough at first, you see, without you surprising him too.

But, let him have it for a couple of more commands, and then say, "What went on?" But maybe a couple of more commands, his eyes opened up, and he was bright. And he's all cheerful. And again you say, "What happened?" You know? I don't care how you say it. You don't have to say "What happened?" or something like this, see. you say, "Hey! What happened?"

"Oh, wow!"

You know? He's liable to give you some kind of a stuff like this, and he's never had anything much to say to you before, you see. And he's saying, "You see, all these dark octopuses came swimming up out of this particular area. What do you think that has to do with getting my watch fixed?"

That's fantastic, you know. What's it got to do with it, you know? And you found a heck of a big not-know on the thing. Well, help him out. Say, 'Well, what have you forgotten about octopuses?"

"Huh, they're timely." I'm sure it's something like that. "That isn't right. No. No. That isn't right. I don't know. What have I forgotten about octopuses? Forgotten about – never knew any octopuses. I never met any personally. What's it got to do with getting my watch fixed?"

You say, "What have you forgotten about watches?"

"I don't know. I haven't forgotten anything about watches, except I'm always forgetting the t – I always forget my watch every morning. I always forget my watch every morning. Oh, I know. I know. My first wife, ah, yeah, I got it. she ought to say, 'If I had as many arms as an octopus and carried a watch on each one of them, I still wouldn't know . . .' "

So what he's got. He's all – you're all ready, you see, for a whole track expose, you see, and you get something totally different. That's it.

Now, I want you to get snoopy and you'll see this goals mechanism. The not-is of where he is and the elsewhereness of where he is, then inhibits the where he is, so of course this sticks the whole bank and gives him a whole bank and gives him his reactive mind.

The primary source of the reactive mind is not hidden creativeness. It's hidden elsewhereness. The guy wants to be elsewhere all the time. Well, if he wants to be elsewhere all the time and he creates where he is, he never as-ises it, and he winds up with a whole kit and caboodle, doesn't he? Which, I suppose, at some time on the track, he considered a nice trick in order to accumulate havingness, but he has since found that it was more of a curse than a trick. You see what that is?

So the creation of the reactive mind depends on elsewhereness. Elsewhereness is best expressed by a goal. All goals, of course, run back to an area which is not-ised, or which he didn't want to have anything to do with. I want you to look at this mechanism while you're assessing, and also in using your Security Checks, run Not-Know on the incident that turns up. This is the Goals Assessment I've been talking about in this lecture, so I don't want you to get disoriented here. The question has to do with rape. you say, "What's not-known about rape? What have you forgotten about rape? Is there any rapes that you've forgotten about?" Some such question. "What shouldn't be known on the subject of rape?" Anything like this. Bang! You start to get reactions all over the place, and he's in the middle of a heck of a great big incident of some kind or another. Well, don't expect some automaticity's going to erase the incident. Ask him what he could not-know about that incident. What's unknown about that incident? What's he forgotten about that incident. You got the idea?

Flatten the incident. Get the needle action off of the incident. And then get the needle action off of the question again. In other words, when you're taking a security question and running Security Checks by Know and Not-Know, Forget, Remember, you know. When you're running them that way, take the needle action off the question, for sure, as your basic goal, as it always has been. But when incidents turn up, take the needle action off the incidents with Not-Know. It's a fast way and it'll run engrams very heavily. In other words, you're doing two things. You ask him Not-Know about rape, and he's all of a sudden stuck, for God's sakes, in the middle of something wild about rape.

Ask him what he can not-know about the incident, and ask him until that needle goes cool.

Okay? Right.