IMPORTANCE OF GOALS TERMINALS

A lecture given on
25 October 1961

In just a second you're going to clap louder than that, because I'm going to relax the problem of your having to pass examinations in order to have auditing, on the condition that you go on and get your noses to the grindstone and get them passed.

So you don't have to worry about that now. Don't look so spooked. Now you can run out all of your unkind thoughts on it.

Okay, what is this? The 26th of October?

Audience: 25th.

Twenty-fifth of October? Okay, 25th of October 1961. This is planet Earth, isn't it? Yeah. Okay.

Well, now having given you some good news, I'm going to give you some good information. But the main thing that you had better know about goals, terminals, runs and that sort of thing, probably has not been made abundantly clear. I have been on this particular track here for some time and the lecture I'm giving you is pretty much of a hallmark in this particular line. I mean, it's pretty much of a high-water mark, because there's a great many things have been resolved that had been a question for a long time.

You see, when you're attacking life head on, the doors open and the highways go out long and white quite regularly. But sometimes you know that there're some dark woods behind you. And now and then, why, as you're going up a well-known road, why, you all of a sudden find out that that wood is not a dark wood anymore, that you've gotten some data which wrapped up some little bit of something. In putting together the jigsaw puzzle of life, in trying to piece out what it is and what it is all about, you have a problem not unlike having a jigsaw puzzle with an infinite number of pieces and it's almost infinite.

And when you first look at this problem, as when I first looked at it many years ago, it was just a potpourri of odd pieces. And the funny part of it is, they didn't even look like they would ever fit together. None of the pieces were made to fit to any other piece. In other words, it was a brand-new thought that it could be fitted together, in one piece, not in eight thousand different islands.

Now, philosophy in past days has tended to compartment life and you have all sorts

of compartmentations. And philosophy has never actually attempted a total view. It has been a bit beyond them and so they compartmented things up. They do various things and we've used some of these dodges ourselves in the past. I've used some of them as we've come along. I've – well, take Spencer, Herbert Spencer. He said that there was two zones of this and that and he broke down various things; but within the framework of this and that and conditional to this and that, you then had a rule. You get the basic thought that goes behind this. You have things like the knowable and the unknowable. And that's an awfully interesting word – *unknowable. Oooooo.*

Well now, more to keep people from worrying about it than any other reason, I have used that analogy in the past, but that was more to keep people from worrying about it – not that I thought there were unknowables. I just said that there were areas that you didn't *have to* know all about before you knew the answers to the situation.

And tremendous reservations . . . Kant, for instance – he not only compartmented it into the knowable and unknowable, but he said that there was transcendentalism and "You, you little worm you – you rat – we're all calm up here on the philosophic clouds, you bum, you stupid jerk. It's mostly all unknown to you and always will be and *nobody will ever know anything that has anything to do with anything that is important, so* just go on and be stupid and be *happy* about it."

I don't know exactly where he got this particular notion but I *suspect it was his bank.* And as we look at this huge, piled table of pieces of jigsaw puzzle, we get some of them together. And it makes a little bit of – more of a picture and we get some more of them together and it makes a little bit more of a picture. And then it turns up a yellow piece. And we've got a picture and it doesn't fit in any part of the picture we have got, so we put it over here on the side and we say, "Someday we will know about this yellow piece, but right now we're not going to worry about it particularly because the picture is making sense."

And we go on and we make more picture and we understand more of it and then all of a sudden there's a green piece. And it's a hexadiagonal shape and it fits nowhere. And we take this green hexadiagonal piece and we put it over here with the yellow piece and we say, "Well, we're not going to worry about them for a little while."

After a while, you've put enough pieces over here, green, purple and pink, that didn't belong in the proper picture that you stir them up a little bit and all of a sudden they go *clank,* and then they become – and they go together of themselves and then they go *clank,* and go into the main picture. Every once in a while we make one of these forward surges. Well, this is one of those occasions. This is one of those occasions.

I can tell you a flat fact. That is to say this is one of these facts that's without reservation. And it's rather startling, because we have done it and we didn't realize there was anything important about this. But we have done this in the past, but it's a fact which

becomes one of the fundamentals of auditing.

Now, I must tell you clearly that auditors are divided into two categories, ritualists and fundamentalists. They're divided into these two categories. There is the auditor who, without any understanding of what he's doing, actually goes forward with the ritual and carries through to the end. And he's perfectly happy and he very often gets a result.

But he runs into more bugs than other auditors. This is the majority of auditors. They go down the line and they think that's just fine. And I appreciate it, you understand, because it demonstrates a very great faith in me. But that's what it demonstrates and that's all.

Now, they would be better off – and any ritualistic auditor who is getting results would get more results and be better off – if he knew the fundamentals on which his ritual was based. If he knew the fundamental. For instance, we say "agreement to begin a session." Now, if he knows what the fundamentals of agreement are, he realizes at once that he's got to have a mutual knowingness about what this session is all about.

And regardless of the ritual, his end product is going to be a mutual knowingness. "We are going to do so-and-so and such-and-such and then we have an agreement." And this agreement then precludes the preclear from having an enormous amount of not-know. Do you see this as an example?

So one auditor could just go ahead and run Model Session and everything is fine and run it off to the end and he comes out, he gets a result. It's an attestation to Scientology and the way it's put together that he can get a result under that basis. But how much better, how much better, if he knows he's trying to get a mutual knowingness about what is going on and make a contract and he's a fundamentalist, he's going by definition. What is agreement? You see? Well, agreement is a mutual knowingness, a mutual postulatingness towards certain end products and he knows if that's absent – if a mutual knowingness about what this session is all about is missing, that there's going to be a not-know throughout the session on the part of the pc. It's all going to be a little bit of a mystery, so he's not going to make as fast a result as he would if he were auditing by fundamental.

Now, you can audit by fundamental and use the ritual, you see. You could actually succeed by just using the ritual and not knowing the fundamental, which is quite interesting, but you could succeed much better if you knew the fundamental which underlay the ritual. And also used the ritual. That way, why, you have many more wins.

Fundamentals are quite important and this is one of the fundamentals of auditing which has been missing right up to this date. We could not answer this formerly, but if you have traced through – I think you could trace through the lectures for the last several years and occasionally find a remark by me that I have for a long time studied this particular facet and hadn't yet an accomplished answer to it, a finished answer.

That is, is it better ... I even thought I had it licked one time and it was very close to licked, but it is not quite right. "Can you audit conditions at all?" Now, we've inclined very definitely up until recently, up until now, to believe that you couldn't audit conditions very successfully, that you should audit terminals.

Now, let's clarify this. Let's clarify this. Let's classify *terminals.* What *terminal* can be run on the pc? And this is one of these great basic facts of auditing, so flap your ears. The *only* terminal that can be *run* on a pc is his *goals terminal.* And *no other terminal* can be run with impunity on a pc.

You can run another terminal for a short time. You can run it rather limitedly. You can appear to be getting away with it. Everything can be going along *fine, you* hope, and all of a sudden the bank stiffens up and the pc doesn't seem to be making much progress and so forth.

That's because you're auditing *another* terminal than the goals terminal. Now, factually, on the long haul you can get away with auditing these terminals sometimes for twenty, thirty, forty, fifty hours. You can get away with them for a while – and all this will become very visible to you shortly – but *you cannot* continue to audit any terminal which is not the pc's goals terminal. The only terminal which can be audited with complete impunity, with total unlimited runs, is the goals terminal of the pc. And that is all that can be run in the way of terminals with perfect impunity. That's a fact.

Nail it down. Give it its proper level of importance because it will solve for you "Why did the pc's tone arm go up to 5.0 and stick?" It went up to 5.0 and stuck – refer to this particular moment and you will know why it went up and stuck. You must have been auditing some other terminal than the pc's goals terminal. It doesn't matter what other terminal. You must have been auditing another than his goals terminal.

So if you were running his goals terminal and it went up to 5.0 and stuck after you began the run of the goals terminal and then it got sticky and sticky and sticky and there was something real wrong running some double-barreled process (such as your groups 10-way bracket that you're running right now) and the tone arm went up and it stuck and nothing happened *ha-ha-ha,* there's something wrong with the goals terminal. That is what is wrong. You're auditing some other terminal than the goals terminal.

You are busily, busily, happily clearing up a present time problem on the pc. You're happily clearing this up and all is going well and all of a sudden the tone arm starts going up and it goes to 4.5 and the pc gets very logy and it gets very sticky and starts to comm lag and gets misemotional *-ha-ha,* you're running another terminal than the goals terminal of the pc.

Now, there's two things which can make that tone arm go up and stick. You understand, "go up" is all right. Go up, go down, who cares? But go up and stick. Now, that will happen on a Prehav Scale run and it does for this reason: You've exhausted that particular

line and you must get over onto another part of the Prehav Scale. There, it is the Prehav Scale that is doing that. But on the 10-way bracket, if it did this, you've not got the right terminal, that's all. There's something wrong with the terminal.

Withholds can make the tone arm go up and stick. And running the wrong terminal can go up and make it stick. Running the wrong terminal on any process. Now, there's a great temptation to run a present time problem and so on.

You see, this particular class has helped me resolve this and I wish to thank you for it. You haven't suffered for it particularly. Pon was crying the other day and I recognized at once why she was crying and I use her as a particular example. I examined her auditor's form, wondering about this and I found out that she had been run on the ARC break process very hard and very long. And what happened?

She was going up – if you don't mind my using this?

Female voice: That's all right.

And she was running along happily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily and everything was going along fine and then all of a sudden started to get a little bit misemotional to the auditor and a little bit upset with things in general. And then they went along and ran the ARC break process a little longer and the tone arm went up to 5.0 ' clank, and there it stayed.

And they kept on running it, but Pon didn't – didn't calm down and didn't feel better. Now, I see today she looks much better and I think they undoubtedly are following the auditor's report directions which I gave out last night. I'm sure they ran a terminal today. And she feels much better. Isn't that right? Probably not *much* better, because the terminal itself cause ...

But look at this. I wish to use this as an example because it's right here in your midst. Now, the ARC break process refers to an auditor and refers to a pc. Ah, those are two different terminals than her goals terminal. These are not her goals terminal. See? That comes under the heading, then, in spite of the fact that it's cleaning up auditing ...

It doesn't work like this on every pc, but it'll work *eventually* like this on every pc, you see. It doesn't work fast on every pc like that, but it'll work that way eventually. And this will become very comprehensible to you when I go out and tell you all about the mechanism involved in this thing.

Well, what happened here, see? The auditor is not her terminal, a pc is not her terminal. She has been run on an auditor and a pc, running that 15-way ARC break process and her attention is being taken off of her goals terminal and her bank is beefing up.

Now this is the Create/Six phenomena. It is right here. The Create/Six phenomena is not involved with creating. And I've known there was a spook back of that and every time I've

mentioned that to you, every time I've gone over it, I've had some little reservation. You remember, I've always made a little bit of a reservation: "Well, I don't know why this happens," you know? "It doesn't seem reasonable to me. And it doesn't happen with me and if it happened all the time, why, it should happen. But some people's banks get very solid when they start creating. And so we don't run Step Six."

This has happened enough times, you see, so that we abandoned a process which was not uniformly a bad process at all. Why? Why? And that little question has just stayed around. It's one of these yellow pieces with orange polka dots. Lord knows where it fits or how. Why do some people run Step Six – which is "Create something. Create something. Create something" – and have the whole bank go solid? But just a few people have this happen. And other people run "Create something. Create something. Create something," and as a lot of old-time auditors right here in this room can tell you, you can go on and have them create things and create things and nothing bad happens. They go on and they get well and everything else. Well, why does it only happen to a few?

So if it was create – if create was the total basis of this, why, then – then of course it would work on everybody. Only it doesn't.

All right. Instead of saying, like the ancient philosopher, sitting on his stone – it was probably very unhealthy sitting on stone, but anyway – sitting on stone, he said, "Well, there are different types of people. There are different types of bank. Everything is different, you see and you have to have understandings of fifteen or twenty different classes because, you see, they don't all head under and respond to the same principles. So men are different and thetans are different and it's all different, you see. And therefore, after you get through studying the alpha system, then you have to study the beta system and then you have to study. . ." you know and here we go, you see?

Well, I don't work on the same principle. I'm perfectly welcome – it's perfectly welcome for there to be great differences, but if you have the answer to life and the mind, you don't have different types of cases and you don't have some cases responding to something and other cases not responding to something, you see. It must be that you're not quite down to the fundamental. It must be that you're dealing with a fundamental which is not rock bottom. You must be up the tree a ways.

Well, in this particular instance, I'd never accepted that create phenomena without protest, even in lectures when I talked about it. Maybe you can remember my having objections to this, here and there. "I don't know why" I would tell you.

Well, it isn't create. That's why. It's wrong terminal. That's *why, huh-huh-huh. Hu-huu.,* a little difference here, *ha-ha.* Some people are so stuck on their goals terminal that you take their attention off their goals terminal and the bank beefs up. Or when you were running create on them and telling them to mock up things, you were having them mock up

things other than their goals terminal, which were off their goals – terminal line and it distracted their attention off their goals terminal, so bank picked up.

So we get another fundamental here – not from that angle, this is from another angle entirely. This is empirical. I've watched this and watched this and watched this and I noticed that banks become solid and the pc gets more somatics and the pc gets more misemotional about the thing and things get more tough and it all gets tougher and tougher and tougher, rrrurrerr – he's sort of going into concrete.

What is this? Why? It's running the wrong terminal. Running another terminal than the terminal of the pc's goals chain. The pc's goals terminal doesn't do this. And it is the only terminal in the case that won't. There is just one available terminal in any case, one available terminal and that is the goals terminal of the pc. There is only one goal. There is only one terminal. And if you run that terminal, no matter what you do in the way of a process, the bank will not beef up. It'll not become solid. But if you run any other terminal longer than its basic tolerance or until the pc notices you're running it, why, he gets cast in concrete. You know, I mean, he gets misemotional, the engrams get tougher, you get more screams, the circuits suddenly start acting up, and so on. The case gets rougher.

Now, usually in from three to ten days you will get a drop out of this. If he doesn't get any auditing for three to ten days, it'll just disappear. It's not a particularly dangerous condition, beyond the fact occasionally in Dianetics or Scientology somebody has suddenly had weight added to them in the process of processing.

Why? Why? Running something else than their goals terminal, that's all. Every time you saw increased weight by reason of auditing, it was because the bank was becoming more solid; it was manifesting itself on the body line and you were running something else than a goals terminal.

That will be good news to several Scientologists.

Let me call to your attention that the – I must say this in defense along this line – this fantastic situation where every person is walking around with a different valence. All from the same source, but every person has a different valence and it is usually different than the identity he is.

It is true that the terminal, running a terminal – this is perfectly factual – is much superior to running a concept, but the only terminal that can be run is the goals terminal, which is the added statement on the end of the line which makes it completely factual and useful. You audit against a concept and the pc's havingness will go down or something else will occur. You must audit – if you're going to audit for a long haul or do anything permanent for a case, you must audit a terminal. But what terminal? It is only the goals terminal of the pc that is available for auditing. If you don't know that terminal, you cannot run any terminal. I cannot

say that too emphatically.

Don't run any terminal if you don't know the goals terminal of the pc. You can do almost anything with the goals terminal of the pc. Let us say the goals terminal of the pc is a "motor machinist's mate." Unlikely terminal. "Who would be a motor machinist's mate?" Anyway, his goals terminal was a motor machinist's mate.

Well, I don't ask you to experiment in this particular line, but you possibly could do something like this: "Mock up a motor machinist's mate. Thank you. Mock up a motor machinist's mate. Thank you. Mock up a motor machinist's mate. Thank you." And then nothing would happen. Nothing would happen bad to his bank. He would get the total kickback of his terminal. Oh yeah, he'd be very upset, but it will be emotional upset from the terminal and that upset will reduce and discharge and it'll run out.

Now, why wouldn't some – I go clear back to 1950 – why wouldn't some engrams run and why wouldn't other engrams run? And why, when running some engrams, did they just get tougher and tougher? And why, when running other engrams, they got softer and softer? Now, why?

Well, because the engrams that ran out were on the goals-terminal chain and the engrams that weren't on the goals-terminal chain wouldn't run. Now, I've already shown you here in the – just a few weeks ago that an engram that lay on the goals-terminal chain ran like hot butter. If you knew anything about running engrams at all, it just ran out and swamped up. There was not any great difficulty about it. It ran easily and the pc felt much better afterwards.

But if you ran one which was off the goals-terminal chain, as some of you knuckleheadedly did ... You know, I mean you're doing a Goals Assessment and the pc all of a sudden gets an engram and you say, "Well, Ron says it's all right to run engrams" and you all of a sudden run the engram and you made no progress. and something happened with the Goals Assessment and everything would start to blow off and little jets of steam started to come out of the pc's ears and it didn't work. You had your hands on an engram that wouldn't run.

Why wouldn't the engram run? Because the engram was not on the goals-terminal chain and did not contain in it a terminal of the pc's goals chain. In other words, his terminal wasn't in the engram, so it didn't run.

Now, how we got away with running as many engrams as we did, Lord knows. This bug sat there all the time. So some engrams ran and some engrams didn't run. You get a person early enough on the track and you usually run into his goals-terminal chain, so we went basic, basic, earlier, earlier.

The "earlier" principle still applies, perfectly valid. You use it today on the prior

confusion to knock out a hidden standard. Marvelous. It'll work. You get the prior incident that underlay all the incidents. The first time the individual ever had an overt against Dianetics and Scientology, you can park his whole case until you find it and then the rest of the chain blows. That principle is right there. But lying right alongside of it there's another principle. And that is, in running engrams, if it is not on the goals-terminal chain of the pc and does not actually contain his terminal and is not directly related to his terminal, the engram will not run. And that's all there is to it.

That terminal which is not the goals terminal of the pc, that item in the bank which has nothing to do with the goals terminal of the pc and so forth, have only a very limited run and if run too long at some point in the line either at once or twenty hours from now – will all of a sudden find the bank going solid. Fantastic, isn't it?

I know some people hearing this and some people thinking about this and looking at this, are saying, "My God, we've been walking a tightrope." Yeah, we have. We have; we've been walking a tightrope. There was a fundamental there, which was a goofy fundamental – an oddball fundamental of some kind or another.

It wasn't much of a tightrope. I had the ends of the thing pretty well nailed in. They were well set in concrete. Very few have fallen by the boards, but nevertheless there was that spook factor. And now we discover it. Well, it's a good time we do. This is our first year of clearing, where we're doing very wide clearing. We certainly better know this now.

All right. Then if you can't – for heaven's sakes, if you can't run anything but the goals terminal of the pc and if you can't neglect running the goals terminal of the pc and if you can't run other terminals on the pc, then how're you ever going to get a rudiment in? How are you *ever* going to get a rudiment in? Because they contain other terminals than the goals terminal of the pc. Oh-ho. Well, that's horrible, isn't it? And how are you ever going to clean up any present time problem of long duration if it's not on the goals-terminal line, huh? Becomes impossible, doesn't it? Huh? Isn't this fantastic? Well, fortunately it's not impossible. We'll go into that in a moment.

I looked at this with a ghastliness before I brought it up here. All right.

Let's go into the basic and exact mechanism and I'll show you the other mechanisms. Let's go into the basic, exact mechanism of why the bank acts up and won't erase if you run something else than the goals terminal of the pc. All right. Let's take this object. Let's take this object here. All right. And this object we will say is the goals terminal of the pc and this object over here we will call an other terminal, other terminal.

Now, you're all of a sudden – to see why life becomes practically unlivable and why, also, the people who have been going around spreading these *nice* quiet philosophy, like "It takes living in order to live your life out. You have to do some living, you see, in order to erase

it totally." Oh, yes, that's around, you know. "Processing isn't enough." You hear this occasionally. "Processing isn't enough."

We get some old mystic philosophy or something – somebody will say, "Well, you have to do some living too, you see." And now we get where they get this "living too." "You have to go out and live because it'll spin you in every time." Now, I'll show you how this all amounts to.

All right. Here we have the pc valence. This is his goals terminal, this is the valence that you plunge for and that you assess so crudely and so circuitously for with the valence acting up and the rudiments out and you eventually find it. And outside of Saint Hill they occasionally find one, once in a while. They haven't found a right one yet but they find otherwise. All right. That's actually just – that's just – put it under the heading of a dirty crack. That's all it is. It's true, but that's ...

I just had a lot of cable traffic today on exactly this subject, back and forth, *bang-bang-bang-bang-bang-bang,* all on this subject. "We can't find the pc's goals and we can't find the pc's terminals. And there are no ways to find the pc's goals and terminals." And it can't be because the rudiments are out. I mean almost. Wasn't this bad. But I took it in that frame of mind. I just chose to be annoyed and superior.

All right. Here's a thetan. He's in the middle of this thing. And this is his terminal and there it is. And the basic postulates on which this goes in are quite interesting. And as soon as you know this, by the way, you could probably, by using fundamentals and a little bit of Straightwire, occasionally make a case go *bzzut-bluu-vlum!* You know, not clear him but make him feel awfully odd. All right.

The basic is this: As long as the thetan – he knows this – keeps his attention on his goals-terminal valence, as long as he keeps his attention on it, it is all right. Everything is all right. This is introversion deluxe. As long as he keeps his attention on his goals terminal, everything is all right. The bank is only normally psychotic, and these various things occur.

Now, to this and appended to this goals terminal we have innumerable considerations, packages, personalities, postulates, circuitry and machinery. It's all a complete package. Here it sits. There have been others. There have been earlier ones. But I'm talking about the one which is now available to the auditor and which can be run with impunity and which you find with your ordinary and general run assessment. As long as he keeps his attention upon this valence, he's okay. All is okay. The bank will not misbehave; it'll just be normally nuts. He's taken care of And that is built into the machinery in which he is operating. That is the built-in strata on which he is functioning. And as soon as he puts his attention on any other terminal – now get this – as soon as he puts his attention on any other terminal, he's doing something that is not quite right.

He is rigged so that the valence in which he is will assert itself The punishment mechanism is that the valence gets more solid and more assertive and more *it,* the second that ... The thetan, you see, punishes himself by the basic built-in mechanism and the basic fundamental of the valence that if he puts his attention on anything else *then* the valence is going to do something *extraordinary;* it's really going to act up and it's really going to call attention to itself All right.

So he puts his attention over on this other object and instantly this valence, his goals-terminal valence, goes "*Woof-rrrruuuum-creak, ummm-UMMM, MM-MMMM-MMM MM-MM-MM! Uh-uh! Somatics! Somatics please.* Calling all somatics. All right. Calling operator, electric-current switch panel, mysterious current passing through temples. Numb feet, numb feet, calling up numb feet." There it goes. The whole machinery goes into action as soon as he puts his attention on another terminal. Now, you thought I was talking about auditing, huh? Oh, I'm not. I'm talking about day-to-day living. Oh, oh. Isn't it fantastic that the more terminals he is asked to put his attention on the worse he will get. And we have just found a big hole in the road called life.

I'll go over that again. The second he puts his attention on any other terminal than the one he is interiorized into, it acts up and he gets his head knocked off one way or the other. And that applies to life.

So when he sees a streetcar conductor, if he were to *see* the streetcar conductor, the bank would start acting up because this terminal is what we call the bank.

An interesting thing. I have found – I've found Lucifer out today. This was the rig. He goes up to see the bank manager. If he puts his attention on the bank mana – you see, his terminal doesn't even have to be anything related to the bank manager. If his – he, by the way, would be fairly comfortable, comparatively speaking, if his terminal were to be an arch bank robber and it wouldn't be quite so bad putting his attention on merely a bank manager. If they were slightly related, why, it might not be so bad. But his terminal is a washman and he puts his attention on a bank president, you know? The bank president startles him: the bank president says, "Well, all right, I'll give you an overdraft and extend your loan" – depending on what country he's in – you know and it startles him.

You know and for a second he looks at the bank manager. Just for a second, you see, he puts his attention actually on the terminal called bank manager and his bank goes *creak, creak, creak, creak, bing!* One of these pinball machines you see in these penny arcades, because he put his attention on another terminal.

The pc is drifting along in-session, being well interiorized in running and all of a sudden the auditor drops the E-Meter. Now, just the mechanism of attention sliding off of what the pc's doing is, of course, a shock and a surprise, but that doesn't account for the repercussion that very often occurs.

The pc is well interiorized into his valence because he is running and all of a sudden his attention is shifted over to another terminal, whether it's E-Meter or auditor or – it doesn't matter what. Over to another object or terminal. His attention is shifted outside of this goals terminal.

It could happen to him in life, but in view of the fact his attention is fairly comfortably relaxed on his goals terminal, one way or the other, on his bank in an auditing session, it's just the magnitude of shift. You see, he's more interiorized and it exteriorizes him harder, so his bank goes *crunch! clank!* Gets solid and acts up.

All of the mechanisms by which he prevents himself from becoming other than this goals terminal go into action and punish him back into becoming the goals terminal. Interesting mechanism, isn't it?

Life, you see. He goes – he sees a fellow student. He feels nervous around this fellow student, you see. He feels nervous. Now, he'll feel as nervous about a fellow student as the fellow student is appearing. A person is as nervous about any other terminal than his goals terminal as it appears or manifests to him. It's a direct proportion.

In other words, the more he is forced to put his attention on another terminal, the more nervous he gets, of course. It works out quite easily and simply.

So here's his – here's the pc and his goals terminal. He's going along just dandy, just fine. He's living totally interiorized. And as long as he never sees anything and as long as he never meets anybody, as long as he never really notices anybody, as long as he never talks to anything or notices the physical universe in any way whatsoever, as long as all this is occurring, he is all right, he thinks. Now, that he can gradually become familiarized with his surroundings or gradually familiarized with other terminals is just marvelous. It just comes under the heading of familiarization.

But if you familiarize him along the line and then suddenly familiarize him rather too suddenly about something of the sort, the whole goals-terminal structure, which is being violated up to this point, will go in again, *clank.*

Life is an aberrating activity. Well, there are other terminals in life. Now, you wonder why people don't see well. Well, if they don't see well they don't have to see any other terminals and if they don't see any other terminals of any kind, why, of course, their bank doesn't beef up. If they see any other terminals their bank will beef up.

They're teaching themselves this lesson all the time: "If I look not at something else, if I put not 'mine' attention upon any other terminal, I won't get this cotton-picking backache." They know this reactively.

Now, everything in Book One applies. It's how the fish protects himself from being eaten and how he uses restimulators and all that sort of thing. But the one restimulator and the

one mechanism that he used is not sufficiently delineated. It's in Book One. It tells you all about it in Book One, 1950, but it doesn't press it home. And there's one factor missing in that book: that there is *only one* such terminal. And there's one consequence missing in the book: that if he puts his attention on *anything else in* the way of a terminal, to some slight degree it's going to mess him up.

Well, I just level with you. There's the data. There's the data.

You get out and board a bus, the conductor comes by – click, click, snap, snap – he wants your pennies. You get along just fine if you just hand him the pennies, you see. You see, don't really notice him, don't pay much attention to it, you know. It's perfectly all right. But if he then goes *snap, snap* with one of these punchers, you see and your attention goes this way, you say, "Damn that," you know? You get – you get about what the borderline is.

There's apparently some tolerance and probably the tolerance varies from person to person to the degree that they've been forced to look at other terminals. And they can tolerate quite a bit from another terminal before they go *booe* . They can tolerate quite a bit. They can talk to people. They can go to parties. They can talk to people. They can act around.

But, actually, life is not peculiarly life that has nothing to do with the mind. That's the way it's mostly been regarded. But why is it that people, as they go along in life, quite ordinarily go to less and less parties. People ordinarily become less and less gregarious. Well, naturally.

I don't think bodies wear out. I think the thetan's – not the body's – the thetan's goals terminal beefs up. And when it beefs up to a killing point, that's it. And that's age. I think this mechanism is that pervasive in life. So you see it's pretty, pretty fundamental fundamental, isn't it.

All right. Well, this puts us in a bind, ladies and gentlemen. It scraps every rudiments process you've got, just like that. It's not possible. You can't put rudiments in, obviously. It violates this rule. Obviously, you can't audit a person because the second that you put his attention on you, the auditor, why, the goals terminal beefs in and he gets worse. So obviously auditing is impossible. Obviously, you can't clear up the minor difficulties of the individual if it involves running other terminals. That leaves you with just, of course, a Goals Assessment, a Terminals Assessment and a goals terminal run, period. That's what it leaves you with as effective auditing. That's the lot, as far as effective auditing is concerned.

So the importance of Routine 3, in those characteristics, could not possibly be overrated. We've come back onto the highway and all of a sudden found out there's just one road there. Mess up that road and you've had it. Uruuh! That's a bum show, isn't it?

Look, you can't run the auditor out, because he's a terminal. So if a fellow had too many bum auditing sessions he would have had it, right? Finish him. You may as well think

this thought through in its most gruesome – most gruesome lines. I'm presenting it to you with as much crepe on it as possible. If you find some places on it where I haven't hung any crepe, why, you supply them to yourself You can see that it's a closed channel.

A person who's had a lot of bad auditing, of course, that's ruined him. It's obvious there's no recovery from anything, except by his goals terminal. Yeah, but his rudiments are out so nobody can find his goals terminal and he's not at Saint Hill; he's being audited by somebody who read a – read a short leaflet on it.

So this gets very interesting, doesn't it? That's as narrow a view as you can get. Now, can the view be expanded at all? Now, these long yards of black crepe, festooned about, give us this other aspect. Is there any slightest peepholes of light shining through the funeral crepe? Are there any? Yes, yes.

Here's another bug. Here's another bug datum, another interesting bug datum. It's a purple piece with cross-diagonal orange and blue slots. It's shaped like a biscuit cutter, dissected and made into a tolahedron. And it's ridden along with us for a long time because every once in a while an auditor has sat down and run fifteen or twenty different processes on a pc, all of them figure-figure, think-think processes and the pc's got a tremendous case gain. Next time we try the same processes or anything like these processes, nothing happens.

Did you know this bug factor occurred? You must have run into it yourself. You must have asked somebody to think of being well, sometime or another, you know or something like that and ran this for a little while and something wonderful happened with the case. And then you got hold of another case and you said, "Think of being well" – with great confidence, you see, you did this; enormous confidence – "Think of being well," you know. And the fellow says, "All right, so what?"

But this funny looking piece is this: that cases have recovered on conceptual address; they have recovered from running concepts. When I first dreamed up Concept Processing, way, way back – I guess it was – I don't know, 52, 53? 52.

A bunch of psychiatrists and chiropractors and a whole bunch of birds – next year or something like that – they read all the bulletins carefully, backwards and, God, had something like "conceptualism" and so on. And they just took this original material. Actually, for – at one time, I think only four or five years ago, they were running two or three hospitals in the United States and this is all they were doing. They were doing it all messed up and backwards and they weren't getting much in the way of results. But it – there was something there.

And I didn't know how much there was there. And fortunately – fortunately, I knew basically that it was only a terminal proposition and I knew you couldn't do anything unless you did something with a terminal.

But it was – it's taken a long, long time to sort out what terminal and to find out how

to get that terminal and how to run that terminal well. That's taken a long time to do. And if we'd stopped with conceptual activities, significances, we never would have gotten anyplace; nobody would ever clear on significances, but you can make people feel better.

The reason you can't clear on significances is, of course, significances are part of the package of the valence and terminal. They're the valence that the pc is in on his goals-terminal line, see? His considerations can be shifted around and it doesn't do very much. It's processing the terminal. See, but you can shift the terminal's considerations somewhat. Don't think you can't.

One of the ablest of these processes is old Rising Scale Processing. This can change a terminal package around faster than anything you ever heard of. But it doesn't get rid of the terminal, but it doesn't *beef it up;* it doesn't get it *upset.* And you can audit it.

And you can lay this one down, not for very permanent results, not for any broad wonderfulness, not for any spectacular thing – merely a miracle here and there. Depending on the good sense with which you pick out the concept, you can audit concepts on a preclear. You can audit concepts on a preclear as long as they do not in any way hook up with a terminal. That is the basic rule. You can audit concepts on a preclear as long as they do not in any way hook up with a terminal other than his goals terminal. That can be done – and that's fairly fortunate for you.

But here's the limiting factor from an auditor's practical viewpoint. Not that it limits this, but the auditor, trying to apply this, is going to every once in a while goof He's going to think he's running a concept or a significance when actually he is running a terminal. He'll say, "Let's see, we can run concepts and significances so it'd be all right to say, 'What does your mother think?' That sounds good." All right. "What does your mother think? Thank you." "What does your mother think? Thank you ... Thank you. . . "

Tone arm starts up, you know. "What does your mother think? Thank you." Tone arm goes on up higher. "What does your mother think? Thank you." Tone arm gets up to 6.0. "What does your mother think? Thank you." Tone arm sticks. "What does your mother think? Thank you." "I don't know. Ron said that you could audit concepts as long as they weren't connected with any terminals. Uh, *oh,* wait, wait. Oh, *oh. Oh!* I've – I've been ... *Oh, oh, oh, oh! I'll* have to run this out in my next Security Check because I've been running his *mother. I've* been running a *terminal* on the pc, you see. And because I had *think* connected with the terminal, I for a moment, you see, didn't realize there was a terminal there." Now, that's a very gross one. That's a very gross one.

You can – you can duck one like this and you can say, "Well, what would – get the idea of running away from things," you see. "Oh, that's good. That's an easy concept, see. Doesn't put anybody's attention on any terminal." And the tone arm starts up, it starts up and it starts up. And the only thing it is, it's got a terminal mixed up with it, see.

Now, you can get away with running "you," because this covers, to some degree, the goals terminal, see? You can run "you." But you can't run anybody else, not on a pc on a concept. All right.

And you can – here's the next big, broad basis of it: You can security check terminals. Why can you security check terminals? Because the person's overts and withholds from the terminal in a limited sense were when his attention got pinned on another terminal than his goals terminal and if you can separate his attention at those points on the track when they have been pinned against other goals terminals, you of course are less activating his goals terminal. You are picking out times on the track when his attention got onto other people selectively and pinned and stuck on other people and you're picking those points off. And not running any repetitive process or fixing his attention on the terminal and in any particular way, but by getting his attention on the things that *pinned* his attention in the past over onto the terminal, he therefore feels better.

And that's why a Security Check works. Hasn't anything to do with God and sin. Has to do with broken mores and attention pinned on groups and it has to do with all those things, that's for sure. But I'm talking about just why would coming into the church and confessing that you just murdered one of the choir boys last night, for immoral reasons, produce a tremendous case gain, as they claim? See?

Well, his attention – he's got an overt and he's got a withhold which pinned his attention on the track on another terminal than the one he's on. You weren't saying, "Think of murdering choir boys. Thank you. Think of murdering choir boys. Thank you. Think of murdering choir boys. Thank you." Eventually, the only thing that's coming through to the pc is choir boys, choir boys, choir boys and his bank start – is likely to get solid. See, he's liable to get a high tone arm and get very upset and that sort ...

Now, why does the high tone arm occur on a withhold? Why is it accompanied by a high tone arm? The person is withholding something and so forth. It's because at that point on the track their attention is pinned on another terminal, other than their goals terminal, so you get a high tone arm. You got that one? All right.

Now get the idea of a time track and the individual at intervals in the past has had this mechanism violated by life. Life has demanded of him that he take his attention off his goals terminal and put it on another terminal. And of course those are best expressed under the heads of overts and withholds. So there's the points where his attention is on other terminals.

So if you can just knock out those points delicately – flick, flick, get the overt off, get the withhold off – he frees from that terminal and his attention is no longer, at that point of the track, violating his goals terminal, so he feels better. So knowing that rule you can security check with impunity, as long as you don't put his attention on too many terminals.

That is to say, let's not sit down and make a list of 8,795 people and then let's say, "Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother, Mother" – and all of a sudden the pc's tone arm starts up, up, up, up, up, up, up. Of course, it's the auditor who is putting his attention on the mother.

See, the auditor is not disengaging his attention from Mother in the past; the auditor is putting his attention on Mother in the session. Now, you get the two differences there? That's a very delicate difference. We can say, "All right, now, what have you done to your mother?" Plang.

"What was that?"

"Well, I did this and that. . .

"Have you ever withheld anything from your mother?"

"Yeah." Plang. "Did that and so forth."

"When was that?" Plang, you know. Boom, bang. "All right. Now, have you got any other withholds from your family? All right, that's fine. When was that one? All right." You know. Just – you could run almost regular Security Checks.

As long as you don't say, "Well now, what sort of a person was your mother? Now, was your mother very mean to you, one way or the other? Now, was your mother a big woman? Was your mother a small woman? Did your mother talk loudly or talk softly? Exactly *how* did your mother ... T' And all of a sudden it gets to be a word *Mother* to this fellow, with letters about six feet high, you see and it's all massy and bulky and he feels very crushed in and starts to feel sort of solid and sort of upset.

You've just taken his attention off his goals terminal, that's all. You've stressed the other terminal too much. You get the idea?

So you can get the overts off and the withholds off. Oh yeah. Well, this takes off the times on the track when their attention got stuck on the other terminal. And as long as you don't get this other terminal pushed into a point in the session where their attention is being *fixated* on this terminal which is in violation of the goals terminal, their bank won't get solid, they will recover and they'll feel fine. Okay?

I gave you all the rudiments processes that are effective processes here several lectures ago. They are very easy processes actually. The basic process is this: "What's your attention been on lately? Thank you."

"What *has* it been on?" Not "What could you look at?" You see, "What could you look at?" is a violation of the goals terminal. "What has your attention been on?" I just give you that as the fundamental form. "What has your attention been on?"

You could spot where his attention had been on things and the rudiments would clear

up. So here's a fundamental way. This is actually part of a lecture of some two or three months ago.

You've got a present time problem. All right. Don't run problems because problems bring up terminals and the person then finds himself facing a terminal and then you'll find the problem doesn't run because it's not his goals terminal and you're going in circles. So you don't run a present time problem. You merely spot the problem, when he has had it before and try to get the earliest time his attention was on such a problem. You just sort of backtrack it and pull out the earliest pin and let his attention just come on up to present time on the thing. And you'll find out that the problem has discharged without running terminals in connection with the problem.

You understand, rudiments have not been unsuccessful because they are not run very long. You're not putting his attention on this terminal over any long period of time, so you've gotten away with them. But recognize, we can recognize now that we have gotten away with something.

And you can continue to get away with this and you can go on running rudiments processes the same way you are running them without running into too much trouble. But here and there you're going to run into enough trouble to cause us to gradually graduate it over to merely this "What has your attention been on?"

All right, let us take an ARC break. All right. How would you clean up an ARC break? You would say, "Well, do you recall any other AR – any other things there that were bad that you didn't – you know, was – your attention was on saying something to somebody and you just couldn't say it and so on? Do you recall any other circumstances like this?"

"Oh, yes, yes.

"Oh, well, got another one? Oh, yeah" – boom. "Got another one?" – boom. "Got another one? Yeah, that's right."

"Oh well, I see what's wrong in the session now," the pc says. "I've – I've been trying to tell you something and I couldn't tell you," see? His attention is still stuck on trying to communicate to the auditor or something of the sort, see.

Find out where his attention got fixed in the session and unfix it and of course he'll feel better because it's not in violation of his goals terminal. Simple. So if you just specialize, in rudiments, in unfixing the pc's attention where it is fixed, then he will feel better.

You see, wherever his attention was fixed on the past track on another terminal than himself, he violated his goals terminal, so it's a little aberrated point on his track. He feels a little bit funny about it.

It's amazing the amount of – number of terminals that pcs can actually look at without

spinning in. But if you take auditing, with all of the heavy – drill mechanics back of it and try to make them face up to a terminal in auditing, wow, wow, wow. It gets to be pretty wild. I mean, you keep bringing up ...

Well, let us say that you have taken up his mother, you have run his mother; and it was perfectly all right; and it worked out all right. And you ran his father and you started running his father. And this had nothing to do – you never assessed this fellow and you've run his father and you were just going to clean up his whole family, you see. And you ran his father and you ran his father and you ran his father and you ran his father. And, I don't know, the tone arm seemed to be getting up and the case seemed to be getting sort of sticky. So you ran his father, so you ran his father, so you ran his father, so you ... The case seemed to be getting awful sticky by this time and you couldn't quite see what the devil was happening on the thing and you sort of knocked it off. And you decided, well, you couldn't do very much about that. And you just skipped it after a while.

And three or four days later it was all right. You asked him about his father and he didn't seem to be particularly upset, so you let it go by. Have you had that kind of thing happen? Well, that's what's the back of it.

You're putting his attention on Father and his father was a wild violation of goals terminal. So was Mother, but you see it's Mother plus Father made quite a lot of violation of goals-terminal attention, you see and by the time you'd gotten – some pcs you could get fifteen family members or something like that up the line before they finally went *clank!*

So Sec Checking can be done. Disengaging attention fixed in the past can be done. And goals terminal running can be done. Everything you have learned about prior confusion becomes terrifically valid if you omit the problem running. Don't run the problem because you immediately and at once run into groups and other people and other terminals.

All right, that's what I learned from you. I watched your tone arms going. Boy, you sure had a time. That's why I changed you over quite rapidly on to running your goals terminal so swiftly, on almost the identical process. Of course, it was a good thing. You got used to the process, got used to the form, got used to auditing it and it didn't do anybody any particular amount of damage, except one class member, and she's recovered today, so that's all right.

And there is the view of the thing. Don't – just in the interest of not goofing, just in the interest of having nothing funny happen in the session, just in the interest of everything going along smoothly and the pc never having any ARC breaks – if you want to have no ARC breaks with the pc, keep his attention on his goals terminal and run him on his goals terminal. Never put his attention on the auditor and never let his attention go on anything else but the goals terminal, *pockety-pockety-pockety-pockety-pock.*

Now, there's another mystery on this I'd better tell you about, is why did it take one

of thirty-six or more of thirty-six Havingness Processes? Some pcs ran on one Havingness Process and some pcs ran on the other Havingness Processes. One of the thirty-six Havingness and one of the thirty-six Confront Processes do not violate, for some peculiar reason, the goals terminal of the pc and therefore, remedy his havingness and let him move on the track. For some reason or another they're all various combinations of commands and it sort of lets him walk through a gate.

So you ask one pc, you say, "Look around here and find something you can have." He can't run it. The thing gets stiff Why does it get stiff? Violates – *"attention must be on his goals terminal."* His attention must be on his goals terminal, you ask him to look at the wall. Oh, no. Well, you've asked him to look at the wall in this particular way and that's no good. So you finally ask him, "What emotion does that wall have in it?" or something like this. Oh, he'd tell you that. That's easy. And for some reason or other this doesn't violate his goals terminal. It's where the concept of the havingness and the concept of the confront are matched to the now-I'm-supposed-to packages of the goals terminal.

And where these things are exactly matched – where the havingness is matched to the goals terminal and doesn't violate the principles of the goals terminal and where the confront doesn't violate the goals terminal and matches its principles, then that havingness and confront works like a bomb on the pc. You only find two or three or four of those processes will work on each pc. And there's thirty-six of them and pcs work on all different ones.

Now, what's variable in cases? What's variable in cases is the goal. What's variable in cases is the terminal and the now-I'm-supposed-to's that go around that valence. And these can be infinite. You can have the most complex sort of a valence. Think of your own valence just at the moment – did you ever see so many complex facets to anything in your life as that valence?

Well, people really don't understand what a bank president is. They really don't. He does this and he's now-I'm-supposed-to do that and he's now-I'm-supposed-to here and he's now-I'm-supposed-to there. And for practically every answer and facet of life, the bank president has an answer. It's marvelous, absolutely marvelous. And as long as you don't violate any of these particular principles, you can live a happy life. At what cost? Well, just the cost of you, that's all. Of course, you can't be a good bank president, either, because it takes more than I'm-supposed-to to be a bank president.

But somewhere in those Havingness Processes – somewhere in the Havingness Processes, somewhere in the Confront Processes – there's one or two or three or four that work. Well, they don't violate the terminal. They're not necessarily what the terminal would do or not do, but they are not in conflict in some mysterious, alchemical way, with the now-I'm-supposed-to's of the valence. And so you sort of found a little hole in the picket fence it went through. Well, that's very good.

Now, we're also, then, in contest with looking at other holes and for other holes in the picket fence in the way of how do you do things with a case. Well, most concepts would be functional as long as they're strictly concepts. They'll patch up a case a little bit.

Of course, you can't change this valence around. No, the valence is in in concrete. You can run the valence out, but you can't change it around. But running concepts you can make somebody feel better and you can alter something of their considerations. And remember there's a thetan there, too. And concepts are a hole in the fence. Because it's all right to put his attention on an idea, but it is not all right to put his attention on another valence.

Therefore, you have innumerable people able to absorb or pay attention to or have concourse with ideas that cannot have any concourse with masses. They cannot observe masses. They can't do anything with masses or people or something, but they can do something with an idea.

Well, a hole in the fence is that the – an idea is not a violation of the valence terminal. Now, *unpinning* attention off violations of the goals terminal in the past – you see, times when his attention has been fixated over on another terminal. . . Of course, that was a violation of the goals terminal, so you're patching up that; you're of course freeing his attention on the backtrack. And that's done by Security Checking.

So Security Checking is a wide hole in the fence. Now, there's another hole in the fence, is that you can run any problem by picking up the zone of prior confusion and see checking it. His attention stuck on the problem because his attention was already stuck on violations of the goals terminal prior to the occurrence of the problem. So you can always get rid of a present time problem by finding the incident of prior confusion.

I did this the other night with Mary Sue. Just the most mysterious thing you ever saw. You get used to these sort of things – takes it in stride. I was thinking about this and I noticed that after you – after you left, she was wheezing and sneezing and so forth. She was sitting in the other room and there was no heater in there and she was very cold. And I noticed that she put on – as any Texan would – put on a wool sweater and then she put on a coat over the wool sweater and then she put one of these driving-sports-car, heavy-padded jackets on over that, you see and she was looking around for a couple of shawls or something.

And I said, "What goes on?" She says, "I'm cold." So frankly, she was under a very heavy pressure to get her reports done, don't you see? And I was standing in the door talking to a lot of you, you know and I was slowing her down, you see. So time was sort of stopped. But her attention, you see, was rapidly snapped over on to the group standing in there holding the door open.

Now, you said, "All right, now, all you have to do is get off her overt thoughts of why don't they go home and why doesn't Ron shut the door and why doesn't it get hot in here and

why doesn't somebody turn on the heater?" You know, this sort of thing you would have said. "That's the thing to do and that's all set."

Well, I just made a nice interesting little two-bit test out of it and I did all that. And she was still sniveling and she was looking around for four or five more mackinaws and shawls, Texas fashion and so forth. And then I found that while reviewing your sec checking earlier, she had become just shakingly furious with a couple of incidents where a lousy job was being done and it was the prior confusion.

Everything blew straight up. She took off the mackinaw after throwing me out. I actually ... You get this as an incident? If Suzie will beg my pardon. But you get that as a very homey fundamental little piece of nonsense. See?

The apparent O/Ws that would directly cause the situation had – and the exact problem had nothing whatsoever to do with being parked on the track. That was all much earlier. It was actually an hour or two earlier than that. And then some other incidents had happened and made the earlier incident key in. It was just the prior confusion to what the pc was saying. And she didn't have any recall of having done this other thing at all. She wasn't thinking about it at all. The second it blew into view, that was it.

So actually you haven't lost anything. You have a faster method of getting rid of a present time problem than you had before, when you get a Sec Check of the prior confusion. Just find out who was there earlier and did the needle move while they were there earlier and find out what they did earlier than the time they are worried about. If they're worried about eight o'clock, find out what happened at five. They are very stuck in a fight with their wife as they come into session and you say, "There's a hell of a present time problem. We've got to get rid of this problem and so on, in order to get on with the session." And you say, "When did this fight take place?"

And they say, *"Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho.* It's been going on all evening. It started about supper time."

You say, "Good. When was supper?"

"Well, supper was at six-thirty."

"All right, that's fine. What happened at five?"

"Oh well, that was before the argument with my wife, you see. And this has nothing to do with the present time problem. Because my present time problem with her – she didn't have dinner ready and I had to get back here for the session and so forth and we had a fight."

"Oh well, all right. Well, what did happen at five? Where were you at five?"

"I was down at the lumberyard."

"Well, all right, so you were down at the lumberyard. Who was down at he

lumberyard?”

"Oh well, nobody, but there were those . . ." *Clank!*

"Who was that? What was that? What occurred then? What did you do?"

"Oh, well, I completely forgot. As a matter of fact I fired the foreman." "All right," you say, "thank you very much. Do you have a present time problem?" You won't get any action. You didn't even discuss the fight with their wife. Anything the pc is worried about is pinned by an unknown prior to the fact. That is the rule. Anything that the pc is worried about is pinned by an unknown prior to the fact. Any present time problem is fixed as a problem by a prior occurrence, prior to the occurrence or subject matter of the problem.

I've told you for some years now that any time a pc blew on you, they had had an ARC break for at least an hour – half an hour to an hour and a half. And maybe when I get your goals terminal all run, maybe you'll notice what's happening to the pc and be able to put your attention on the pc without caving your own bank in.

So, you clean up an ARC break. How do you clean up an ARC break? Well, the pc goes *clank, blump, thud,* tone arm goes up, things get sticky. You say, "Do you have an ARC break?"

"Well, yes."

"What happened?"

"Well, you muffed that command." Hm-hm. All right.

Now, let's use the attention – "What was your attention on?" sort of a thing. You get the idea? "When was the first time your attention was distracted from your auditing, from being audited, that you can pick up now?"

"Oh well!" And *bing, bing, bong, thud, boom, boom., pick* up two more, *bang, bang,* another one, boom, that's it. They're in present time, no ARC break. If you don't believe it, try it sometime.

Or it was the fight they had before the session that you didn't pick up as a PT problem. But the ARC break is hanging up and is an ARC break because of a prior enturbulence which is not now in the consciousness of the pc. Anything that is wrong with the mind is unknown to the mind.

You needn't make a full fetish out of that and say, "Well, if the pc says he has a stomachache there is no need to believe him at all, because the pc knows nothing about his case." You see, you could carry this out to a ridiculosity. But if the pc said he had a stomachache and then told you where he got the stomachache and why he has the stomachache, you should realize that this has exceeded the knowingness of the pc, because if he knew where he got the stomachache, he wouldn't have one. But you still use where he got

the stomachache and when he got the stomachache, so that you can get a few hours earlier than that.

Fellow says, "I had a nervous breakdown." All of a sudden, why, it's most – you see, you're all trapped into this as being the most logical thing in the world. He said, "I – I was sitting at my desk and," he said, "my business was semibankruptcy and – and everything was going to pieces and all of a sudden my secretary stuck her head in and screamed at me, 'Your father has just died in a convulsion and uh – his will is bankrupt,' and uh-uh – and so forth and that's why I have this nervous breakdown."

Well now, you must believe that the pc has a nervous breakdown. That's perfectly fact. He can observe that. But why he has the nervous breakdown, when stated by the pc, is a violation of this fact. He still has the consequences of a nervous breakdown. If he knew where the nervous breakdown came from, he would not have the consequences of a nervous breakdown.

So you take the fact that he is suffering from a nervous breakdown – all right, that's fine. And you take the fact of when he thought it started and what he thought began it, in order to get a bit earlier than that and find out what did begin it and start it. It'll always be earlier and always be unknown to the pc. That's how life hangs up.

Now, couple this with the fact that it was always a violation of his goals terminal because his attention fixated on something else. See, his attention

fixated on something else, some other terminal. If you pry his attention loose from having fixated on prior terminals, why, you've got the thing taped.

In other words, Sec Checking works, concept works, getting the person's attention off parts of the track it is fixed on, that works. Running terminals – don't do it. Might as well lay the law down now, rather than soften the blow and try to make myself look very intelligent about the thing. I pat myself on the back for knowing there was a terminal there. Nobody else knew it. Yeah. And now I find out that we've got a firm grip on the terminal. We know that there is a terminal there that is the terminal we're looking for.

And I can impart to you this oddity that apparently, now that the checks are all in, some of the variations of auditing, the ARC breaks of pcs, a lot of "Why does the tone arm go up and stick?" – a lot of these answers are rapidly satisfied by the fact that his attention mustn't be on any other terminal than the goals terminal. And it's only by taking his attention off the goals terminal, by running some other wrong terminal to the case, works.

I'll give you an oddity. Do you know that many Dynamic Straightwire – not very many, but enough to make it interesting – Dynamic Straightwire terminals that – were found for runs in yesteryear are the goals terminal of the pc. Isn't that interesting? They're sometimes worded just a hair different or something like that. It's quite interesting that

auditors here and there just

picked right out off the cuff, you might say, by doing a Dynamic Assessment and actually would arrive with something which was a near throw on it. One instance – the Dynamic Assessment gave the food of the terminal, which the Goals Assessment found. In other words, it was right on the line. It wouldn't have been damaging to have run it.

Did a Dynamic Assessment and let's say – well, this wasn't it – but "chop suey." For some reason or other the only thing that could fall out of the hamper on a Dynamic Assessment was chop suey. And we assessed the fellow and we find that his goals terminal was a Chinaman.

You see, they're – they're matched up here and there that closely… There are probably other methods of crosschecking whether or not the goals terminal is right. There are safeguards of this, having become sufficiently important.

Mary Sue just proposed a safeguard. She says, "Well, why don't you do a Prehav Scale assessment, then do a run on the 10-way bracket on groups and problems on the goal. Not do the Prehav run, you see. And then go back and do another Prehav assessment and see if a lot of new levels have suddenly come live, as a crosscheck."

There are probably a lot of these crosschecks could be used, one way or

the other and you'd know very well whether or not you were running the pc's goals terminal. But the best run is, is the pc interested? Is his case running? Is it fairly easy to keep the rudiments in? And does the pc say, "Oh no, I never want to get Clear"? Is the pc getting upset with life? And is the pc saying, "Oh, I never want to be audited again; this is too ghastly," yet continues to appear for session?

There are a number of tests. There are a number of behaviors which are

peculiar to the goals terminal.

All right. Well, there have been a lot of snarled spots taken off the line and they've made a much neater picture. You possibly will feel a little bit confused. Some of your data you may feel you now have in crosswise, it's been unstabilized. That's why I've gone over it carefully to tell you what data is or is not crosswise. And the only thing I'm telling you is that you have assisted me to the degree of showing me that you cannot run a problem. Can't be done.

We still have the whole Problems Intensive, the whole lot, but we have it in its original version. You go ahead and find it, you find the problem. And you only find the problem in order to find the prior confusion. And then you just sec check the prior confusion and you've got your – your Problems Intensive is just fine. Just omit running the problem. You get in trouble running the problem, but you won't get in trouble taking their attention off violations

of the goals terminal earlier, even though you didn't know what the goals terminal was. Do you see that?

So it's the same thing. You do it the same way. There's absolutely – everything is just exactly right. The only thing I've got to change on the form is just that one little line about running the problem. You don't even have to word or run the problem and none of you could do that anyhow, so it's all right.

Yeah, you could run it all right, but wording it, that was beyond you, you see.

Okay. So there we are. I've brought you up to date. Some of your cases ought to be running – like startled deer. I've relaxed the rules now on which you're being examined, therefore, I expect you to be examined even more frequently, but not under so much duress. The thing for you to do is to get Clear by Saturday and then start studying Monday, finish up the checksheet by next Thursday and you've got it made. Okay?

Thank you.