POINTS IN ASSESSING

A lecture given on
16 November 1961

Thank you.

All right. It says here the 16th of Nov. 61. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. I'm very pleased to hear that we are getting rapid checkouts. There's lots of people wanting things checked out. It's about time that we got the fire lighted in back of the rocket and took the donkey out of the traces.

This is all about Routine 3D, of course, and the first thing that I would like to remark on is the way people can dream up mistakes, you know. You lay something down and you say, "Well, you put your right foot in front of your left foot, you know. And then, by George – did you know that was only when you used Hessian – when you were wearing Hessian boots? And did you know that was only when the snow was coming down and the temperature was 16 degrees exactly Fahrenheit above zero. Did you realize that?"

This is the kind of – sort of thing I get, you know. They say you do this and you do this, you know. There are no exceptions. There's just that's it, you see. And then you find out that's only when you're wearing Hessian boots. And you get these weird additives onto the situation and that sort of thing And anybody could do it. But they just read something that isn't there, you know. Or they just heard something that was never said.

And we've had a couple of you actually reading the whole list, including those that went null. In other words, you list – take fifteen items, so every time the auditor goes over the list, he reads fifteen items regardless of what went null. If it went null on one reading, then we read it again, see, kind of to see if it's still null or something And of course, the pc goes stark, staring mad. A pc will go halfway around the bend. His bank will practically collapse on him because you've got this thing null, you see, and now you've started to audit it. And nothing'll scrub, and the pictures will start collapsing, and bric-a-brac starts flying about, and the rudiments will go out that way, and the pc maybe doesn't spot what's happening, and it is just a – somebody said on a report today – a cow's breakfast.

Here and there, there are going to be people who wouldn't realize that that would do anything wrong, you see.

You know how I know this was being done? Because there are exactly the same number of check marks after each read. We get an X and then we get a live read after it, and

then we get an X and a live read after it. And although stylized assessment tells us that all we do is put down a slant and as long as it's alive we just leave the slant there and leave it alone, for the purpose of checking, it'd probably be much easier on Ds of Ps if we put a slant down every time it was alive. Some of you are doing that. Then you can see that the item went alive and went dead and went alive and gives you more information. You make a mark every time. The system's perfectly acceptable.

Any system you use is perfectly acceptable as long as it's readable. As long as I know – as long as I know what you're doing with the system. You see that? Nobody's forcing that marking system off on you as a system. But let's have the thing discernible as to what was going on. And the agreed-upon one is you make a slant when it's alive. And when it goes dead, you put a cross – you complete that slant and make it a cross.

And now we could tell if this ever happened again if people kept on making slant marks after a cross.

Now, sometimes rudiments go out. And the whole list goes null, and nothing is reading. The goal isn't reading. Nothing is reading anyplace because the rudiments are out. We go through the whole list, and we X the whole list out. Well, it would save us a little work if we made a slant every time that we went through the list and found something alive or out. If we marked it every time it would save U8 a little work. Why?

Because we only had to go back as far as the rudiments were out, you see. We'd only have to go partially back through the list again. We'd just take those that were still in. We'd see that the rudiments had been out. "There were some stuff alive after the fourth read, and then everything went null, and then something" Well, we've got to reassess again all over. Well, there's no reason really to go back to the beginning of the assessment and scrub it out because we would upset the pc's bank if we did that.

Let's take the point where they all went out and then just back up about two reads, you see? And just reread those and we'll find they're all in again. You see that as a time saver. It's a good idea.

But whatever you do. the only exception – and that's not a full exception to scrubbing them out and Xing them out and leaving them out when you're doing an assessment list – the only exception to it is when everything has gone null and by reason of out-rudiments. And now you don't know where you are at. You get the rudiments in, well, there's no reason to throw the list away. What went out was not the list but the rudiments. And the list ceased to read.

So, you've got to backtrack across all those beautiful Xes, all those items you'd already gotten rid of. You'll just have to move back now into the area where you still had reads and reassess from there on. So in that event, you could see a marking like this: Slant, slant, X,

slant, slant, X, slant, slant. That would look very weird, but it would mean that the rudiments went out and everything went null on the list.

But before you got that kind of a pattern, it must have happened that *all,* the whole list, went null because of out-rudiments. See, you'd have to have realized that. You see what I'm talking about? But just going through, you don't X one out and slant it back in and X it out and slant it in, and in and out and in and out.

Assessment is very remarkable because we are doing basically Assessment by Elimination which at best is a happy accident. I found that auditors were having great difficulty differentiating between the greatest read and the lessest read. And I found out that there was an enormous advantage, and actually helped the case and advanced things and so forth, to assess by elimination. And I found this oddity. That on Assessment by Elimination, you wind up with one item. And it stays in. Now that was a happy accident.

Well, there's only one list on Routine 3D that violates this one item left. And that is the modifier. The modifier over here, which I think is number 4. Yes. Mr. Modifier can easily be left with three, four or five alive before they all null.

Now, the three, four or five alive combined in some peculiar way gives you the modifier. They don't give you the modifier complete. They usually give you the modifier in phrases. So, one phrase of the modifier was at the beginning of the list and another phrase of the modifier was at the end of the list, and a couple of phrases of the modifier were in the middle of the list. And you wind up there, when you get down in assessing a modifier, and you find you've got three or four still alive, well, just assume that in some combination you've got the modifier. Now, if you combine these around and you take these four . . . You know that silly game that they have "Beat the Clock" and that sort of thing, you know, and the girl steps up with this magnetic board, and "a stitch in moss saves nine" or something like this. And she's got some type of thing, you know, and she steps up and she moves these boards over the magnetic blackboard to finally come up with "a rolling stone never has to work" or whatever it is. And you've got – you've got this thing. And they've got to make a cliche. Well, in this particular operation, a similar operation takes place at the stage of the modifier.

Let's say you've got – I don't care if you take five. You've got five final bits. And I can give you an example possibly. But you've got these five final bits. And they're apparently disrelated, you know. "To heave everything overboard" is one of them. "Leave forever" is another one of them. You know, you've asked the fellow what he'd do in revenge or his consequences or his threat or something, whatever you want, in case his goal wasn't reached – what he would add to that goal, you know.

And the list is long, but "just to throw everything overboard" or "heave everything overboard" is one of them. "To leave forever" is another one. And they're disrelated, see; they're a half a list apart. And you get down to the end of the list and you've still got these two

alive. And they're very markedly alive, and they both get the same little funny rock slam or whatever it is that you're assessing the goal, and everything else is following through on, on a pattern. And you should at that moment suspect that the modifier "to build" – "to build ships" let us say, was the goal, you see; "to build ships" – the modifier is not just one of these. The modifier is both of them. And your main problem is which one comes first. That's your main problem. Of course, you do that by asking the pc how do these things fit.

Well, of course, you find out it's "to build ships or throw everything overboard and leave forever." "To build ships or to throw everything overboard and leave forever," you see. That's quite easy to disentangle. But some of them are quite esoteric. And what keeps them tied in is the fact that they are denied to the pc.

He's got them mocked up, but now he can't get back at them again because they're bouncers, they're denyers, they're call-backs. It's a mess.

I'll give you a few tips on this. It isn't as crucial now that you're doing 3D. It isn't anywhere near as rough as it was. You'll find that you can sort the modifier out of this long list of threats that he gives you, and so forth. But for heaven's sakes, write down every one he gives you when he gives it to you because he may say it and bounce, see?

He says, "to leave forever" and that just flicks it and throws it into restimulation and you'll never get it again because he's bounced – he's gone. Now, what do I mean by "bounced"? And if you get the idea of the pc traveling on the time track and then moving off at an erratic angle, he's going from a consecutive moment to moment to moment to moment, very nicely, but he hits moment thirteen, and he goes at right angles. See, he doesn't move up the time track and down the time track. Actually, he just moves at right angles to it. He just leaves that area. And you actually get some of the wildest phenomena.

You'll be auditing along, you'll be trying to find a modifier, and all of a sudden the pc will be in present time. Actually, sometimes in auditing a goals terminal that has a lot of modifiers in the goal that are bouncers – you'll be actually running the goals terminal, and the pc will be sitting there all of a sudden, suddenly, you see, just he'll be sitting there bright-eyed, wide open, and so on. He's looking at you, very alert, and you'll notice there's something strange that just happened and so forth. And he'll say, "Well, I – yeah, it was a long time ago. Yep, well, that's a long time ago. Well, it sure feels better to be in present time. Everything feels better."

You ask him the next auditing question, you know, "What dog's breakfast do you dislike?" And he says, "Oh, I guess I would have liked something or other," something or other, and so on. "But, you know, I think that thing is all erased. It's worked out. You know, I'm not the least bit concerned about it now. Ha-ha-ha."

Actually, what he's done – you don't do anything about it. You just go on auditing him. But you should understand what's happened to him. He's hit the bouncer. And it makes him feel like he's in present time.

Well, if present time was 1 trillion, 765 million years ago, he's in present time all right. But he's gone at right angles, and he's no longer thinking, you see, of what he was thinking about, and it's sort of not any longer in his vicinity. So he's happy about the whole thing. And of course, that's the way he's gotten by in the past. He's hit this bouncer. He's gone off and he didn't have to worry about it anymore. And you'll have a lot of people around who tell you that they have odd things happen to them.

Well, they go on worrying. They can worry just so long. And then *they don't care anymore.* And they actually are not particularly quoting the modifier, and so forth. They're just – they hit the bouncer. And they've observed about themselves that they just worried so long and then didn't care anymore.

And the modifier would be something like this: "Well, but if I have to worry about it, I will leave forever," you know. And they've hit the "I'll leave forever." Bang! They're out of it. It's quite interesting It's like keeping track of a ping-pong ball, you know.

Well, there are down-bouncers. "But I will go back and finish it later," see. Now, there is a down-bouncer combined with an up-bouncer. Isn't that nice?

So, of course, when he hits the down-bouncer, he goes down the time track, goes earlier in time. But a split second later will hit the up-bouncer and be in apparent present time, and you know? And he'll be giving you the modifier list. And you watch. I invite your attention on this.

When you're assessing for modifiers and when you're getting the list, watch the different manifestations of the pc. They get restive, they get twisty, or they'll be very relaxed, or all of a sudden they don't care about it. It seems all right to them suddenly. Everything seems fine. First time it seemed fine for a long time. For a long time. And you'll very often find it's in the next phrase. Exactly what the pc has done one or two phrases ago, you were checking off, you see, is found suddenly in the next phrase to be alive. You get the idea?

You'll hit a bouncer or something and then by your repeating the bouncer, he goes back into this thing, and he changes his manifestation. It's quite wild. And looking for the modifier knocks the fellow all over the time track. The thing is a stuck moment in time. Actually, the goal, the opposing terminal, the opposing goal, the modifier, and the goal-plus-modifier terminal, and the Prehav level are all suspended in one instant of time. See, they had an inception. They started somewhere. And he's noplace else than there. But the phraseology in it gives him the illusion of elsewheres. And he responds with a total dramatization of the modifier with his down-bouncers, up-bouncers, call-backs.

Now, a call-back "but I will leave and come here," *zoooooom, clink,* see? Now, those are – the-command. Anything that you could tell a person to do as an order – to go up, to go down, to go out, to go in, to go earlier, to go later – any type of command that you could give somebody who's kind of in an hypnotic trance, you know, make him feel that he was earlier or later, are these bouncers.

Now, "out" actually classifies as a bouncer and a denyer. A denyer is the things which deny knowledge of. And that is "never know it," "never know about it," "can't come near it," – which is a combination of a denyer and a – see? All of these phraseologies which any phrase that you can think of in any language that would deny a person knowledge of something would be classified as a denyer.

All right. Now, the most important of these are the bouncers, whether up or down, the denyer, and the call-back. And that's the "come-heres" in it, you see, and so forth.

Now, classified *with* these call-backs are the stickers. And you, of course, have been finding stucks on the track ever since you've been auditing And they are stuck phrases in modifiers. "Stay right here and wait no matter how long it takes." That would not be unusual to find in a modifier. It parks the person on the track very effectively.

Now, the oddity is here that these semantics do exist in the modifier and do exist as appendages to the goal. That's an oddity, but they do. And you can count on finding them. The goal, of course, is in plain view: "To build ships." Oh, well, to build ships, naturally – the Queen has crowned him in the past for building ships. He's been complimented for building ships, and so forth. And everything has been going along fine about building ships except one thing: He just never seemed to succeed in building ships. Everything happened but the building of ships.

He wanted to build ships. He knew he wanted to build ships. But he somehow or another never really gets down to building ships. And he gets close to building ships, it's very upsetting to him. Nobody has ever had a successful career on their goal terminal. They haven't had totally successful careers on that, ever since it became this combination.

There's always been something wrong with the career; and they knew it. It was an unhappy circumstance. They've done it somewhat. They have tried it somewhat. They have always lived with it. And somehow or another it has always worked into the woof and warp of their existence. But they've never succeeded. A person who has a goal to be an actress which assessed out as the only goal and which ran on Routine 3D, you would check back carefully and find that she had many, many, many times been an actress. That's for sure. She'd many times been an actress and gotten shot and stabbed and the theater burned down and producers committed suicide and she committed suicide and everybody in the company who's died, and so forth. And it's just like a Jonah. See?

She had a *goal* to be an actress. The others were just actresses, see? Actors and actresses, that was all right. But she had a *goal* to be an actress, you see? Well, why? Well, of course, there's the modifiers. And she's failed in the goal. And as she fails in the goal, she, of course, adds little threats to it to people who shouldn't keep her from failing in it, you see? That's a preventive. The modifier is a preventive. It makes people leery of stopping you along this line.

That's one of the things it does. It's barbed wire, which is hidden under the water. So "to build ships" – this is great, see. "To build ships, and if they don't go down the ways properly, to fix them so they sink at once; because they will be unlucky, and nobody will be able to live with them or know why." Now, we get this bird, and the Royal Navy gets him over here in a dockyard, see, and he's a shipwright. And it's all right as long as they go down the ways properly. This fellow has never worried. But you can see his fellow workers, you know. He says he worries about the luckiness of it, and he wants to know who's going to launch the ship, what admiral's wife, or what politician's wife is going to crack the champagne on the nose, and so on. The funny part of it is there never has been – if you check with him – there never has been a ship launched right. There's always something a little wrong. The champagne splattered too much, you see, or the ways stuck for a moment, or didn't actually bob properly as it went into the water, you see. And there's always something a little bit wrong with it, and eventually you'll find his fellow workmen a little bit superstitious about ever letting him go aboard a ship after it's launched because they sink.

It's quite untraceable aside from the fact that he always goes down and trips over the plug by accident, you see?

But that whole modifier will be effective. But, look, trying to find that modifier. Look if you've got "to sink." Now, a person hits this, accepts this as a literal connotation, of course, goes out of the moment.

And you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "What?"

"Well, what did you just say?"

"Well, I – I didn't – didn't say anything much. I – I don't know what – just a minute. I've got it." There is a comm lag of some kind or another. "It's something here, something here, something here."

And he'll think around for it for a while, and he'll never get it again.

But if you say, "Sink, sink, sink, sink, sink, sink, sink, sink. Now, what was the line?"

"Oh, to sink them."

And he's right back in, and you've got a read back on the meter. Now, the dangers of finding a modifier consist of the fact that they go on and off the meter. Ha-ha. In other words, a person can bounce out of that instant in time and cease to read on the meter.

Now, of course, we've taken the weight, actually, off of the modifier by finding the opposing goal and the opposing terminal. And we've got those things found, so the weight is actually off, and the modifier is more visible. Actually, the case isn't under as much pressure as he was under because you've already located the enemy for him. And it's easier to find the modifier, but you will still very probably get into situations in finding the modifier where the whole list goes null.

Everything else is in, but the whole list is null. You can find nothing. It was reacting. It isn't reacting It would be the most mysterious thing you ever saw if you don't know the data I'm giving you here. It'll just be a total mystery. And everybody will be able to run Routine 3D right down to step 4. And then every so many cases, they will strike one that is, "Well, I got as far as the modifier. We never did find the modifier. Why?"

Well, the case is very live, and the case dramatizes the modifier so heavily that when it says "leave," he leaves the incident, and it won't read. When it says "sink" he sinks below the incident, and of course it won't read. And when it says "never know about it and nobody will find out," of course, he never finds out.

In other words, he does everything idiot simple that it says in the modifier, which is quite remarkable. A modifier does not also care about spelling Anything that could be translated through is quite marvelous. He rowed a boat. R-o-a-d a boat, see? R-o-d-e a boat. You very often find him putting to sea with boots and spurs on and think it was quite necessary.

Quite in addition to r-o-w-e-d a boat. This is idiot. This is Simple Simon idiocy. And any language the pc gets into, the modifier shortly gets translated over so it's now expressed in the new language. Interesting, isn't it? Because in the first place, the modifier is a thought, and if you believe that all thoughts are semantic, why then, of course, nobody can think without talking

Actually, this whole thing is conceptual. And you'll get a conceptual line, so at various times of his career, the concept is transferred over into the homonyms and synonyms of the language in which he happens to be living at the moment. And it has different – it has quite different homonymities. I can't think of one in Japanese particularly, but that would be a doll, you know.

Anybody that ever picks up a body in Japan must go practically mad because practically everything means everything. So any concept of leaving would get translated into any Japanese word that sounds like the Japanese word "leaving." And you'd have homonymity. Well, a homonym, of course, is he rowed a boat. Which "rowed" are you talking

about? You see? R-o-d-e, r-o-w-e-d and r-o-a-d. They're homonyms. It's actually, they're close homonyms – sonic homonyms. They're spelled differently which is why I'm trying to use it to get it across to you. But just rowed. Well, in Japanese "to eat rice," "to cross bridges," "to blow your nose," "to kill your wife," is probably all under the – under the same word *weh*. See, every *weh,* and that could mean any one of those. You'll see two Japanese in argument and they have to get out pencils and papers and write the katakana characters up in the corner. And they write the Chinese character. And they write the Chinese character down to show it to each other.

"Oh, you're talking about your shipyard. Ah, ha-ha-ha, I see, I thought you were talking about the theater."

What it is, is a very intellectual people unfortunately inherited a melee sort of dialect which wasn't much of a language. And then the Buddhist priests came in and taught them to read and write in Chinese. And so their written tongue is enormously expressive with something on the order of, I don't know, three hundred thousand words in it, all with different Chinese characters, but not pronounced the same as the Chinese pronounce them. But their spoken language is baby talk. And people look at you with awe when you say you can speak some Japanese.

I don't know why they'd look at you with awe about speaking Japanese. Oh, reading Japanese, well, they should look at you as a miracle of all miracles. In the first place, it'd ruin anybody's eyesight as the first and foremost thing, you see.

But that's homonymic. So the thetan would get – would have this thought concept going through – to build ships or sink them if they didn't go all right, if they didn't launch all right. And he'd have that concept through, but it'd transfer into all homonyms in Japanese.

That isn't an important point to you. It's just a little side comment. In other words, he'd think, you know, "building ships, launching ships, sinking ships, and going away," and so on. He'd think this, you see, but it wouldn't be verbalized.

Now, that nonverbalized thing, of course, adapts itself into the language, so he will verbalize it. And probably the first time it ever gets adapted into the language, in some cases in some parts of the modifier, is when you're auditing him. There'll be parts of the modifier which have been dramatized but had never been vocalized. Never have been vocalized, see? He's never vocalized any part of this. It's just remained hidden. Well, the last five hundred languages that he spoke, the modifier actually was never verbalized into those languages either. They were simply dramatized whole cloth.

Well, when you start finding them, you get all these oddities, and particularly those that had been verbalized by him. He very often will use parts of his modifier as a cliche, one of his favorite cliches. Or they will be some kind of a slang phrase in the society which

happens to match up to the Englishization of the modifier. We'll see an example of that. Let's see, what's a good cliche?

Oh, "spin in," see? All right, "spin in." Well, there's something in his modifier that is going in circles for the thought concept could go in circles. And he hears this slang phrase "spin in" and it means go crazy. Well, his modifier actually has never meant go crazy to him before, but it'll backflash right straight back into the modifier, and now it means go crazy. You see?

In other words, he can reinterpret this modifier because it's actually just a thought concept which is held suspended in time, which gets translated into the various languages where the person is at work.

Now, you, trying to find these things, are plowing straight at something which he has for eons – oh, well, worse than that – that's a short period of time compared to how long the pc's had this, you know. And he just – there he is. And he just literally – takes it literally, dramatizes it. Anything with the thought concept, there – he'll do it. He'll do it mentally. "Leave?" He leaves. He gets the idea of having left, you see? So the phrase "leaves" occurs in the modifier. He instantly gets the idea of having left. The thought concept "come back" occurs in the modifier. Heh.

You'll see him come back and never know it. "Nothing there. I don't know it – anything about that. I don't know why you keep asking Is the meter reading Well, it couldn't be reading Couldn't be reading, no. There's nothing there." And you in desperation keep repeating "There's nothing there. There's nothing there." It isn't part of the modifier. It doesn't make the needle nick either.

And then I want to show you the next trick. He's given you a long ruddy list, and you've been very, very careful to write down everything he said. A modifier list is, if anything, trickier than a goals list because you must write down everything the pc says very carefully, and you must not lose it.

Don't mislay the scrap of paper, you know. How would he take revenge on people? How would he modify this goal if it failed, and that sort of thing And, well, "And when they're launched, yeah. And when they're launched, good. Particularly when they're launched. That's right. Yes, it's a – it's actually 'to build ships and launch them.' It's 'to build ships and launch them.' Yes. Well, that's how I'd modify. I would launch them."

Don't argue with him. Put it down. It's the modifier. You write down what he said it was the first time, see? Because in this particular case he said, "To build ships when they were launched." Get it right, see. But it launched him. Get the idea? So he can't quite come back into the vicinity of the thing again because he's launched. Get the idea?

So he'll give you an – he'll give you an interpretation. So, he gives you the modifier usually right the first time. And then he modifies it. He modifies the modifier.

Now, you don't want the modification of the modifier. You want the modifier. So you write down what he gave you the first time, and don't go arguing with him and don't ask him to clarify it. When you're writing a list, don't ask him to clarify a thing You just write down whatever he says.

Well, just how else would you – that's a good rule for all assessing and making up lists; just write down what the pc tells you. We just had an example of a goal having been held up in its discovery for something on the order of about seven months. Not here. A way away from here. And the original goals list was kept in scrap notes *rephrased* by the auditor. Not one of them was phrased the way the pc gave it. And they were all changed and altered. And they were kept on little scraps, and the piece of paper evidently is written diagonally across corners, you know, and so on. It's just a bunch of junk. And written across the sides, and so forth. And just notes, you know. One word of the goal, you know. Well, he wanted to fly airplanes so whoever it was writing the list just wrote down over here in the corner "airplanes." That was great, you know.

And you know, nobody was ever able to assess that list. And just about ten days ago somebody assessed the list by first getting the pc to give them the goal for each one of these scraps of notes and making a proper goals list of everything the pc said.

And it was such a relief to the pc to get all his goals written down the way he said them, and not rephrased by the auditor, that it practically cleared up the ARC break, and it was only something on the order of – I don't remember exactly – I think it was five hours to find the goal.

And the goal was that close to hand. It was that easy just as long as one did a neat job of listing exactly what the pc gave you. Well, this becomes very crucial in the modifier. You're not going to get anywhere near as many modifiers as you are goals. You might not get thirty modifiers. You might not get fifteen modifiers.

But if you wrote each one down – this is what I wouldn't be able to find out if you did so that's why I'm covering this thing laboriously. The pc said, "Well, when launched – ummm – um – um – um – I'd launch them." You write down "when launched." And write down "I'd launch them." See, write them both down. Write whatever the pc gave you.

Now, supposing this thing is all full of bouncers and call . . . I'd be very suspicious of a modifier list that didn't have any of these trick phrases in it.

Very suspicious because the goal would never hung up – be hung up without a modifier with tricks in it. Nothing is hanging up the goal.

Just as somebody who's used to construction work, you ask him to believe that the roof is standing there with no walls; when you show me a modifier list that hasn't any bouncers, call-backs, denyers or anything of the sort in it, I sort of think of myself as being asked to look at a building where the roof is standing in the air with no walls. I don't think it can exist. I wouldn't bother to walk around the corner and look at it. Something's wrong here. That would be the first – a major thing that could happen.

You'd find out you wouldn't get the person's modifier either, probably, on such a list. There'd be something tricky about the wording of it. It'd be something a little, little offbeat and a little weird about the whole thing Something like the order "and never be there" and "not know it" and "not find out" and "not have it" and "leave" and "come back" and "go a long time later" and – it's kind of a mess of words that are – that keeps the pc out of the vicinity of the goal.

You see, there has to be tricks like this in a goal line. Otherwise, it would have as-ised years and years and years and ages and ages and ages ago. There has to be something that is misdirectional. You call these phrases directional phrases or misdirectional phrases. And there's something – there's something about it. And there's usually several combinations of them.

Now, we go down this list that we have written and the pc at never any time says anything that's the least bit weird, you know? It's "to build ships and paint them," "to build ships and make people happy," "to build ships and be happy about it," "to build ships and feel good about it," "to build ships . . ." Our luck is out today. That's about what we would think about that time. Our luck is out.

About that time, we would repeat our question more loudly and a little more forcefully. "What would you do to get *revenge* on people if they didn't *let* you build ships. Would you do anything like that?"

"Oh, I'd leave them, of course."

Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh. Yeah, well, clever that time, weren't we? Crafty, huh? You just back it up to him, you know, and get some more of those, get some more of those. Get all the things a fellow might do and would do. And then go ahead and assess this list, just as such.

And if all of a sudden you wind yourself up with nothing and you assess the list again – you can't wind up with nothing – and you know, you're just winding up with everything null, and it's all out; don't assume that you haven't got the modifier. You've *got* the modifier, but the *pc is dramatizing* it to such a *confounded* degree that he's not there.

You know what you do then? You can take a red pencil and you can go around each type of Dianetic phrase, everything down the whole line, and draw a circle around every, "and

come back," "leave them," "and look at it later," "and never inspect," all such types of phrases, all such types of phrases. And now you do an entirely specialized type of assessment on this. You get the pc on the meter, you got that meter sitting there, and you're just going to do this.

Now, I might as well give you this trickery. Now, you don't have to be an expert on it because I've already fixed it up the other way, though in the majority of cases you just get the modifier, *bing!* But you should know all this about modifiers, you see, because it's a piece of technology, long established. What I'm giving you here is the basis of what I'm giving you in 1950.

Anyway, we take the first one, and that was a denyer, see. "And never find out if I had failed." See, that's the first. "And never find out." We don't care about the "I have failed." That will turn up later. But we do care about this "never find out." What a beautiful denyer, you see? So we got the pc on the cans, we got her right there, and we just chant – start chanting: "And never find out. And never find out. And never find out. And never find out. And never find out. And never find out." Read! Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. We've got a read. "And never find" – that's gone, too – "And never find out. And never find out. And never find out." Now we got a read, all right. Now well mark that particular phrase with a little symbol to show that we got it to read.

And we take the next one: "Go down. Go down. Go down. Go down. Go down. Go down. Go down. Go down. Go down. Go down." It read. Oh, that's nice. That's fine. That's all we want to know at this stage of the game. So, we make a mark that that one read.

The next one is "leave it out." "Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out. Leave it out." Ah, skip it. Skip it. That one's null, see?

The next one we had found – you see, these phrases are masked in the things they had said. And we're just – we're not now assessing the whole thing they said. We're only – we picked out all the Dianetic bouncers and call-backs, and, you know, all that. And we've just got circles around those exact little phrases. You know, it may have been – well, the phrase "and then I would have to get out for sure." We're only interested in the action phrase. The action phrase. So it's "get out." Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. "Get out." We're not interested in "then I would have to." And we just sit there and we say, "Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out. Get out."

And the pc'll all of a sudden say, "Yes, get out. Yeah. Get out. Get out. All right. Get out. Good."

Boy, that really hit. "Get out." See? You've worn it out to a little bit. To a degree. And you've got him back in it, see. You grooved there, see. *Whew!*   So we mark that one over

here as that grooved him in, and we put a fact that that is nice and live. And we go down the list and complete it similarly. What are we doing? We're knocking this modifier's edges off of it so that he won't dramatize it, so that he can read it. In other words, he can tell us what it is.

Now having done all that, we have deintensified all of these command phrases. Some of them were live. Some of them weren't live. But we remember, we had several command phrases here that we did get good live ones on like "get out." See, that was a nice one. And we had a couple of others there – "leave." So we know that "get out" and "leave" and one or two or three more type of command phrases occur in this thing. And we just write those things down consecutively in a line. They're totally senseless.

Now, we'll say, "Well, how would 'leave' fit into this modifier? What would it be about 'leave'?"

And we're getting a read now, you see, on "leave."

"What will – what about 'leave'?"

"Oh, I'd leave them. Ha."

"All right," you'd say, "I'd leave them. I'd leave them." It reads.

All right. Good. Leave them. That's nice. Ha-ha. Good. *Phew!* All right. Now that's one of the phrases in the modifier.

All right. Now, let's take this other one: "Get out."

All right. Now, how would "get out" apply in this – to this goal? Now, where would that fit in? The pc will smoke around about it for awhile. And he'd say, "Well, it'd just be 'or I'd have to get out.' 'Leave them or I'd have to get out'," which doesn't make good sense, but you write it down.

All right. That's part of the modifier. Now we've got two phrases of the modifier. All right, and we've got another one. And we had "climb." "Climb" got a reaction on our list. How does "climb" fit into the modifier? And "Climb. Climb. Climb. Climb. Climb. Climb. Climb." Doesn't seem to be there, you know. "Climb. Climb. Climb. Climb." Thing's charged up again. "Climb. Climb. Climb. Climb. Climb. Climb. Oh, climb. Climb. Yeah, well, how would climb . . ." See, repeat it back into it again. Don't let him just bounce and try to give it to you. "Climb. How would 'climb' apply here?"

"Well, I would leave them and climb to the top, or they'd have to get out. I'd leave them and climb to the top."

No, it isn't quite right.

All right. You've got another action phrase or two, and you fit them in, and you eventually fit yourself together some kind of a wild modifier whereby he would "leave them

cold, never let them find out what he was doing, climb to the top as somebody else, and come back and kick them all out."

You get the bzzzzz-zzzzz-zzzzz? Look at the command phrases in the thing, you see? It just shoots him all over the top. Shoots him all over the bottom of the thing.

He's at – out at right angles, left, right and center, see? Get the idea? Well, he literally obeys, in his position in time and space, he literally obeys these command phrases. And he touches them, and then he gets away from them, and it's the auditor's job after he's touched them and gotten away from them, not to just let him sit over there in left field, you know.

"Well, I don't think there's any more to that modifier. I don't quite know why you're doing this particular part of the assessment. I – no – I – there's nothing more to the modifier. There's nothing more there."

And you say, "I wonder if it's 'nothing more there'." Well, you're just kind of Q-and-Aing. He's hit an earlier bounce.

"Nothing – nothing more there. There isn't anything to this modifier."

All right, you start looking desperately, and you say, "What was the last thing we were going over?" And you look down here and it was "get into left field and stay there until I make a proper catch." Baseball goal.

There he is. He went over in left field, and he's just waiting there to make a proper catch. And you're just bothering him. You get the idea? You watch these sudden behaviors. You won't get behaviors like this on any other portion of a 3D. The modifier – assessing the modifier at number 4 is that peculiar.

Now, fortunately you don't have to work too hard for these modifiers. No, why? Well, you get the opposition terminal off the setup, and the person doesn't have to make himself so right, see? And he has less of a sense of failure here, and so forth. Now you get the opposition goal off.

"Ha-ha," he eventually says. "So that's what they've been trying to do to me." "Well, I – ho! What do you know? Ho-ho." Azzzzzz.

He also doesn't feel so revengeful because he knows who he's shooting at.

Now you ask him for the modifier. He'll give you a list of modifiers, and you can assess them. But when you start to run into any trouble on the modifier, get your rudiments in very carefully. Look over the list you've already gotten on the modifier. Add anything to that list. Ask him again. Try to assess the thing down. You can't get that thing assessed down, it's doing something like suddenly all goes null. Everything goes null. You're halfway down the list, and everything goes null. That doesn't make sense, does it? The rudiments aren't out. They're in. And yet everything went null.

Ah-ha. You look up there, there's "leave." "Leave." You hit "leave" and he left. Sometimes in repeating these things to the preclear, you know, like "get out, get out, get out," something like that. He just sort of feels like he's being blown, you know, out of this whole corner of the universe. It's that powerful, and you start repeating it, and of course you discharge it and bring it down, and these phrases may be quite reactive. And you'll find a pc going this way, maybe, you know. Every time you go through the modifier close up, the pc goes this way, you know. Or every time you get into the goals area, the pc goes this way.

Something like that can happen and be in the modifier. You could actually give an incomplete modifier and it'd still be in there. It'd turn up eventually, but I'd try to get a modifier quite complete. I'd shake a modifier down very well on a meter. And then, if you're just round the bend and you don't quite know what to *do* about the modifier, and the pc is acting *very peculiarly* about the whole thing, just take your red pencil, *schlooop,* and go down any list you have made on the modifier and you just circle every command phrase on this. And you just start down with just those command phrases – denyers, bouncers, call-backs, fixers – whatever it is. Just circle each one and then just start in at the top and start repeating the command phrase only until you get a read. And it doesn't matter if that read is constant or sporadic.

If you get a sporadic read, you take that command phrase and you write it down here on another column. That acted.

All right, now, let's get the next command phrase. Let's see if that has anything to do with it, and we repeat it, repeat it, repeat it, repeat it. It knocks.

All right. We write that command phrase down. That's in the modifier someplace.

Now, the next one. Repeat it and repeat it, and it's nothing. It's not there, so we skip that one. And we get that whole list of command phrases. And don't kick yourself too much in the head if you miss a command phrase, because you sometimes will look at the list – and it's not your bank after all – and you don't interpret one of these phrases as being a command phrase.

For instance, "undermanned." Well, "undermanned," that's not a command phrase so you don't repeat it. But the pc in some weird way, because he's a man, he goes under it. See? So don't kick yourself too hard if you've missed some of these as command phrases because if you get the bulk, the laws of average are all on your side. If you get the bulk of the bouncers and denyers, you can fish the rest of them up. See, now you're working on a winning horse here. You'll eventually get a phrase and it stays in.

Now you take one of these others that's been active, and you get a phrase and get the pc to tell you how that fits around, and that stays in. And you're kind of building blocks here with bricks, you know. And you're building a little wall, fixing it all up. And it's this phrase

and it's that phrase and then you shift the things all around and how would they be? And he changes his mind a half a dozen times. And all of a sudden, bang! You've got it.

But I don't know that a modifier contains only one phrase, you see. There may not be a modifier in the world that contains only one phrase. Just – there may not be. I'm not saying that all *modifiers* contain more than one phrase, but I'm just saying on the other side that there may not be one that contains only one phrase.

Because look, that thing has got to have kept the goal fixed up and out of sight. And it's got to have stayed out of sight itself. And it's got to have buried the problem. It's the action that the pc takes which buries the problem, buries the opponent, which gets everything out of view. It keeps this thing from ever coming up but sweetness and light, a nice goal "to build ships." Now isn't that nice? And as a little boy he can remember this. He can remember this. Yes, he's had a goal in this lifetime to build ships. Yes, he can remember this as a little boy. Yes, build ships. And you start getting the modifier, and he suddenly starts remembering other things about building ships when he was a little boy. Because every time any other little boy came around the ship sailing pool that had a ship, he was the first one to take rocks and sink the thing, you see?

And every time he did so that he can now check up on, he came down with a cold or got measles or something of this sort, you know. It's quite a – quite a fantastically random area. At first, isn't this sweet, you know, he wants to build ships. Isn't that nice? Isn't that nice? And you eventually find out he wants to build ships and send them out and have them sink every vessel on the high seas, every place, and drown them all. And never have anybody find out about it. See, that's how that modifier eventually trails out.

It's quite amusing But it presents this peculiar – the peculiar complexities of assessment which I have just given you. I don't think right this moment you're having any trouble finding a modifier particularly. You shouldn't be. The modifier ought to be well deintensified.

But, always be prepared. And I would feel remiss if I didn't give you the answers if you did run into trouble finding a modifier. That's how you go about it. Make sure that you list everything the pc says. Make sure of that. Make very sure that after you've gotten the whole list down and you've got it assessed, that your rudiments are in very neatly. And then that as you go down the list, its peculiarities of going out or in don't upset you. But when you've gotten down to the end of the list and you've gone through it several times, if you don't find anything, know what's happened on this list only, know what's happened. It's went. The pc has departed from the list. It isn't a question of rudiments out. It's solely and completely – of course, the more the rudiments are in, the more easy it is to find a modifier or anything else. But it isn't the pc's rudiments are out, it's that you've thrown one of these command phrases into high relief. And of course, he's done it.

And the phrase is in there "or do a bunk." He wants to go to sleep. You never suspect it, you see. But literally, of course, "doing a bunk" would be going to bed or leaving. And he doesn't quite know what to do. Does he go to bed or go to sleep or does he leave? And that's enough of a problem to send anybody to sleep anyhow. So every time you do a modifier list, you – the guy goes to sleep and you keep looking for this. Is this someplace *in the list,* or "sleep my time out" or anything like that, you know?

There you are suggesting things. You shouldn't be doing that either. And eventually you'll find out as you start to take these command phrases, this – you start running into trouble on this. You start running into real trouble when it doesn't go according to – to the book and it seems to be getting pretty grim. It wasn't too bad to find the other three items before this, but this one's gotten grim. Just know what you're looking at. You're looking at the command phrase obeyed. That's all. And so you circle that. Each command phrase you can find in the whole list that he's given you, and just take them one by one and repeat it. "Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave." He doesn't hear you saying anything He doesn't care what you're doing

He's going to react to this, that's for sure. It doesn't matter, see? "Do you mind now if it is all right with me, if you and me sitting here in this auditing room, which I trust is all right with you, if you and me sitting here would find me looking at the meter instead of you and repeating only a small portion of this particular sentence in order to discharge it slightly so that we can get on with it." I'd delete all that from my auditing.

"All right. We're looking for this – this phrase that's here. And I'm trying to find this modifier. And I'm going to go over some of these – some of these words with you – Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave. Leave." Bang! And boy, don't think that these won't have an effect on the pc sometimes because you're going over stuff that's raw meat and rivers of blood. And you start saying 'leave, leave, leave' and the pc starts going . . . You repeat it a few more times and he sits forward in the chair again. Mark that down as live.

But by compiling a sublist of your own of the command phrases, you've actually then got – some of these are going to stay there, some are going to go null, some are going to do this, and some are going to do that.

You can actually take the command phrases and make a separate assessment, and now ask the pc what we can make out of the remainder. And he'll give you the rest of the modifier. Because it's just command phrases, it's only command phrases alone in the bank that prevent you from finding the modifier. It's the phrases in it that prevent you from finding it. And that's all there is in it.

And you take the kick out of those things; you *can* take the kick out of those things. You must realize that an auditor can handle the bank better than the pc, always. So you take these things, and out they go, one after the other, and you take the charge off of them. All of a

sudden the pc says, "Well, of course, didn't I tell you? It's 'to build ships and launch them, and, if anything goes wrong to sink them.' Didn't I tell you those? Well, they're right there on the list. Yes, I knew it myself."

He gets very often, in all assessment – this will – this will sooner or later – you'll come up against a pc who will do this to you. You have just got through wearing out several ballpoints and reams of paper, the batteries of the E-Meter have been bled white. And you have finally gotten the goal "to tat." And the pc sits back and is very pleased about the whole thing and tells you she knew that all the time. Because it's a funny thing about the mind, but they actually do get a sensation of having known it all the time.

Well, of course, after you've known – after you've had something preying on your wits for a hundred trillion years, I imagine you'd get the feeling that you knew it, even if you didn't. But they very often – it's one of the funny little phenomena of the pc that they sometimes come up with something that you've just worked like a *dog* over. And they tell you, well, they knew that. Sort of like "Well, why didn't you ask me. I could have told you that." And they know doggone well they couldn't have. And it's very funny sometimes, a day or two after an assessment, to have the pc acting like, well, he just dug it up, and he knew it all the time, and wasn't anything unusual about it, you know. He can breathe now. He was never able to breathe before. He always went *ahuhhh-ahuhhh-ahuhhh-ahuhhh.*

And it's very funny. As you – unless you complete a 3D on such a thing and deintensify the thing, he does go phases of a false knowingness of some kind or another, you know. He knew all about it. And you almost feel like saying, "Listen, damn it, if you knew all about it, why have you had me working here for five days?"

Big stack of broken ballpoints. Wadded paper all over the floor. Folders grown to a foot and a half thick. "Oh, I knew it all the time. Oh, yes, I always could have told you that – that is basically. I – I could – could have told you long ago. Why didn't you ask me? It was always 'to tat,' of course. Always had that goal. Knew that. What's all the fuss about?"

It reminds you of somebody, you know, who's put a time bomb in the bottom of the building and knocked the whole thing over, and the street is full of rubble and everything else, and he's standing there... He's unimpressed by the whole thing That is very funny.

But, of course, the whole goal modifier versus the opposing goal – of course, this whole thing is in one package. And it all contains knowingness. This is what the pc, by the way, in the final analysis, will be found to know most about. Because he's been accumulating knowingness of various kinds on this subject since *wooo!*

You can do this kind of a trick to a pc. You can take – after you've got a 3D done and before you run anything, you can ask him – you can say, "Well, now, what attributes of a cricket player have you ever used in this lifetime?" He's not been – he's not played cricket this whole lifetime. Every time he goes near a cricket field, he goes uuuuuuh, and falls in. Of

course, he has a bat at home, and he always has wanted to play cricket. He knows he should, you know, but he just never does, and so on. And "what attributes of a cricket player," and he'll suddenly realize that his clothes are all covertly designed in some fashion or another to be cricket clothes, you know.

And when he laid out a garden, he always lays out a playing field. He never has laid out a garden yet. And all of his various equipment, for instance, if he got a shovel in the garden, the only kind of shovel that really pleases him is something that looks like a cricket bat. You know, it's a little off the ball, you see that? And then he lives exactly the same kind of training regimen that you'd have to live in order to play cricket, you see. And he's married the right kind of a woman to be the wife of a cricket player, you see.

And he's mad at her all the time because she doesn't tell him all of the things that a cricket player's wife should do.

But, he's studied the various things that a cricket player should know. He knows all about lawns. He's often wondered why in the name of common sense he can never pass a seed store without going in and getting a new folder on lawns, you know. Because every lawn that he ever plants, you know, just goes up in smoke. It's a complete mess.

And you just ask him that, and he'll start sorting these things out. And actually a lot of this false knowingness will discharge. You know, he says, *"Oooo,* wait, there is something to know."* It's a way of differentiating, you see. It sounds as if you're checking the thing up or something like that and being professional and so on.

And what you're actually doing is getting him to differentiate a little bit. Not a necessary step. That is just – that's just gilding the lily. It's quite unusual. You'll find out the majority of skills will be on the first terminal. First goals-plus-modifier terminal of the pc, the majority of skills which he is now expert in are that – are the skills of that.

Of course, he is here living the life of a plumber and so forth. And the skills he has mastered are those of the deep sea fisherman. It certainly raises hell with plumbing.

Actually, all he knows of plumbing – actually, all he knows of plumbing is what a deep sea fisherman would have to know in an emergency. And he finds it very easy to carry on with plumbing as long as it goes just to that point. Only somehow or another he never gets along in his trade.

He'll actually push his education, and so forth, to that exact zenith necessary to carry out the goals terminal. Just that. He won't push his education much beyond that. There's no incentive.

Of course, there aren't any of these anymore, it's the chief taster to the king Doesn't matter what he's doing in this lifetime, his skills will be that, and his study and his zenith, and so forth, will be that of a chief taster to the king

He'll know all about foods and he'll know all about wines, but to a somewhat limited degree. You'll give him a wine list, tell him to memorize the wine list. He'll go on down the wine list, and he'll tell you there are certain things about these wines. For instance, "Port, very dark. It's not a very good wine. Very dark. It's a heavy wine. It's very heavy. It masks impurities. Poor wine. Now, these light wines, they're much better. You have to be sure they're absolutely clear."

And actually you won't know what this guy's talking about until all of a sudden you know what his goals terminal is, and he knows what it is. He'll know why this is his limit of knowledge of wine. He never seems to be able to educate himself beyond whether wine could be poisoned or not, see? So therefore it's body, color and transparency. See, it's very funny. It's never occurred to him that wine has taste beyond a heavy taste that would mask a poison. So the heavy tasting wines "are very poor, very poor. You should never have a heavy tasting wine. A wine should be very, very simple. It should be very simple on the tongue, you see. Very simple. Like Chablis. Now, there's a perfect wine. You know, drink water, drink Chablis. Same difference, you know."

It's very, very amusing, and yet that will be his knowledge of it. He has just got himself *stacked* in exactly this educational bracket, you see? And then he screwed the lid on from that point on, and that's it. And every lifetime he goes through the same cycle.

But this brings up another point. This brings up another point: is a goals terminal when found is only the total answer to the current case from a mental aspect basis. It will take care of so much in a lifetime that it would be very easy for you to make a total error on the subject and consider that one goals run of 3D and one level knocked out should resolve the whole case. Now, I want to disabuse you of that particular fallacy. That is not going to do it. That is going to go a long ways, and there'll be so many of these things explained, and the person's ceiling is so obviously the exact ceiling of that goals terminal.

Now, all of this looks so good, and there are so many things that you could add up into all this, that it looks as though the case should resolve when you get down to the end of the first run, and the case will not be resolved. The case will still have chronic somatics. The case will still have circuits. And the case will still have a whole new goal valence chain to get out of the road.

Remember I talked to you about onions. Well, you're just getting off the first series. You're getting off the most obvious, most present, most available series.

Now, there's another series back of that, and there's another series back of that, and there's another series back of that. I couldn't give you an adventure – a guess, as all I could adventure on that exact subject, that it would be something on the order of, I don't know, twelve, fifteen, twenty. It's a finite number. It's a small number like that. Now, *they* resolve the case. *They* resolve the case – fifteen, twenty – but not that first one.

Now, you see, you could ask him and he'd rationalize everything. And everything in his life would settle out, and he could be perfectly content and happy with this as the total explanation of it all, don't you see? He's perfectly cheerful with this, only for some reason or other he still has headaches. And he still has this and he still has that and he still has something else. He's got some negative qualities sitting around here someplace that he still doesn't like.

Now, here's the danger of you supposing that one run, one goal, one number 1, number 2, number 3, number 4, number 5, and a completed 6, would totally solve everything there was to be solved about the case. Now, if you believe this, then this is the error you would make. You would let the pc try to solve the case through one valence. True enough, this is the valence, this is the only one available. True enough, that explains all of the current situation. But how did he get in such lousy shape that he could get this valence?

Oh, well, that's all – that's all to be continued in tomorrow's episode of "The Perils of Pauline." That's another story. But your – now, I'm not remarking on that just in play, because this is it.

A pc will try to make an "all" out of a valence. And that's a very, very important thing for you to notice. A pc will try to make an "all" out of the valence. Now, it's an onion with many layers, and you're taking them off a billion layers at a crack. But – and they're all very fundamental, and they're all very marvelous, and they all have various changes on cases, but remember, there's another layer. There's another series of layers. That's the one you've got to get off.

And you expect all of the pressure that goes against the left temple. Ho! And every time he gets this idea, he gets this pressure against the left temple, you see? It's pressure. And he thinks of the goal, and he thinks of the terminal, and he gets the pressure against the left terminal. Oh, man, he's convinced, you see? And he finishes up running the goal, and you know, the pressure isn't gone? It's only partially abated, and it's not gone, and so on. Well, he wants to run the goal some more, you see, because he only gets the pressure when he turns on the goal and terminal and so on, and it doesn't turn on so much now, so he's not quite sure what it is. But there's supposed to have been a pressure across, and it's not quite gone, he can still feel the thing

Well, while he's running – this is the only thing that comes to you with any importance – *while he is running* he will use the valence as a circuit to make it an "end all." And this is one of the little covert points of long goals runs. The reason why they run forever is because the pc is trying to make that one valence do for the whole case. Got the idea?

He actually is going on a via now. He'll answer the auditing question, and then he thinks of something between sessions, you know. "Well, I've often had this little pain, you see, underneath my chin. And I wonder what – what a cricket player – I wonder if a cricket

player – I – yeah, I wonder if there isn't some kind – I wonder if there isn't some kind of an incident here where a cricket player might have been, you know, hit by a or fell down on a wicket, or fell on his face on a wicket or fell on his chin."

Next session, he's sitting there waiting for the cricket player to fall down on the wicket. "Fall on the wicket. No, I don't see any pictures of wickets. See, well, maybe next session one will turn up where the cricket player falls down on the wicket and gets this somatic underneath his chin. Well, I'll wait for the next session and see how that fits in."

Get the idea? He's trying to use that terminal for everything Hell, it has nothing to do with a cricket player. That was when he was a janitor in a castle in lower Slobovia and had made a habit of killing women with knitting needles. And one day one slipped, and he's had this somatic ever since. And it's true enough. It's true enough that for that particular somatic every time he has seen a slender piece of metal anywhere, why, it's upset him. But it had nothing to do with being a cricket player. Follow that?

So in running rudiments on 3D, as the case progresses, you must be more and more alert to whether or not the case is still being audited by you because there could come a time in 3D when the case is no longer audited by you. And that'll be the time you've gone through the 159th level, and there aren't that many levels in the Prehav Scale unless you go over the Secondary Scale. And you've gone to the 159th level of a Secondary Scale and you want to know what's wrong

Well, what's wrong is the pc has been on self-audit and using this thing as a circuit and passing everything through that he was told to do – is being passed through this terminal – long since it has ceased to be an aberrative terminal.

In other words, clearing can be prolonged by the pc turning the valence into a circuit and trying to make something out of the session.

The pc continues now to try to make something out of every session that isn't there. He's trying to make everything that has ever happened to him in two hundred trillion years apply solely and exclusively to just this one terminal.

Now, what you want to do is keep the pc under control, keep the rudiments in every session, and find out if there's anything peculiar going on or if the pc is doing anything peculiar between sessions. And get very clever about this and ask, "Well, are you looking at – you have any pictures between sessions, huh? Since I last audited you do you have any pictures? Do you ever see any different pictures?"

Ah, that's a cunning question, isn't it. It's the same as saying, "Are you auditing yourself since yesterday?" Only it's not accusative, is it? "But did you see any pictures? Do you have any pictures of anything since I audited you yesterday? Oh, yeah. Oh, you went to sleep last night. Oh good – good. Now, what were they pictures of? What were you doing

with them? Oh, you're looking for the somatic there in your chin, and so forth. All right. Now let's see.”

It's going to be a rudiment out, isn't there, because you're no longer the auditor.

So, it is just auditor out. That is all. Because they're getting anxious, they're pressing, they're getting anxious, and the slower you are, the less auditing you give, the more anxious the pc is going to get and the more likely they are to start this circuitry.

And they start this circuitry. The circuitry keeps going on and on and on, and they try to solve the whole case with a cricket player. God! You've got cricket player, and the cricket player – well, before you got through, the only ruler the world has ever had has been a cricket player, you know.

They've always had ideas on government so they sit around wondering, “How would a cricket player have ideas on government?” you see? “Well, there'd be a cricket player opinion, you see, of that. What would be a cricket player's opinion of... And how would a cricket player rule? I suppose you could become a very famous cricket player. And then somebody . . .” You know, and somebody comes down, “Oh, yeah, I see how it is. And you pass it on . . .” And he's got a whole mock-up. It has nothing to do with the case.

Before he decided that he had better not be trusted with anything more violent than a cricket bat, this fellow was Chancellor of the Exchequer. There is no remote connection with the government necessary to resolve the case. Your next terminal coming up after a cricket player is Chancellor of the Exchequer, see? That's one of the covert lives he leads. And its goal is “to handle other people's money,” and the modifier is “and leave them flat broke and then. . .” So of course, he had to become Chancellor of the Exchequer, don't you see.

The only – the only way a crooked banker cannot be caught, you see, is be part of the government or something. That or nobody can – it's – there isn't anybody's money, you see. It's the government's money. So that's very easy to handle, very snide of me. But I'm showing you the – I'm showing you the put-together with this, see? One terminal doesn't resolve a case. It's up to you to press on, press on, press on.

Now, you won't get up to running any Prehav levels in the next couple of days, probably. But if you were to do so, if you were to do so, put a standard five-way bracket together. Just put a standard five-way bracket together. And I can't give you any possible variation from this. This is your safest bet and the tested bet of what will happen.

And just put your standard why, how, what bracket together that makes sense, and then run it to a stuck tone arm. And as soon as the tone arm sticks, get off of it. Well, how – what do I mean “as soon as”? Well, after you are sure the tone arm isn't going anyplace else and before the pc goes crazy, you see – that's “as soon as.” That is – exactly defines “as soon

as," is when you're sure the tone arm is not going anyplace else, and before the pc goes crazy. That actually gives you a margin of about two days of auditing.

I don't think the pc goes entirely berserk until after the second day of being run on a second – on a tone arm. Of course, nobody can find the next Prehav level, and it's a gone dog now. Now, I think you'll find there's a possibility, there's just a possibility that levels on this may only run for a half an hour or so before the next level is gone. It has to be found. So, watch it. Watch it.

We've just condensed a hundred hours of run down to an hour, see. So, watch it carefully, and don't sit around there. Oh, you can run it for twenty minutes to see if the thing is going to move anymore. It isn't going to kill anybody.

He's sort of getting – the pressures started getting tough, tight on his chest. He's starting to talk something like this gurrrrr-grrrrr-grrrrr-grrrrr.

Well, it's time for you to get very alert and say, "You know, I wonder if – how long has that tone arm been stuck? I looked at it about a half an hour ago, and it wasn't stuck then, or was it? Let's see. It's sitting at 4.0 now. And it was sitting at 4.0 when we came into session. I've been auditing two-and-a-half hours. I wonder if it moved, well, let me see. I look over this auditor's report here. No, it's 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0, 4.0. Well, I wonder what's wrong with the pc then. I mean he's complaining about his chest being crushed in.

Well, the reason his chest is being crushed in is the goal-plus-modifier versus the opposition goal are one great big mass. And the more you audit beyond what is necessary to relieve it, the more squash you're going to get. And so you get rising tone arm, rising tone arm, rising tone arm. And some of the tone arm dives, of course. But you'll get a different read on the tone arm. It would go denser, denser, denser, *denser, denser, denser.* And now you'll notice that the tone arm has stopped moving, but the needle is still twitching The tone arm is moving, the needle still twitches. That's a wonderful time to get off of it. You're sure now that that tone arm isn't going to go any further, and the needle is just getting tighter and everything is kind of sticking up, *ha-ha-ha.* Let's get out of there and let's get another level assessed before we kill the pc.

That is the safest way to do it, but it takes judgment. And I actually cannot in all fairness to auditing, not to you, give you a minute rule for how long you audit it because it's going to vary. And some of these things are going to go fast, they're going to go flat, fast. I've seen one of these things come down the tone arm now. I've seen one come down on something on the order of two hours and a half from the top to the bottom of the scale and vanished. Not much of a run, was it? The right terminal sure bit the dust in a hurry.

So your volume of time is spent on assessment. But you go about it. Just form up a five-way bracket; run it, run it to a stuck arm. You will see the characteristics of the arm. You'll see it, and then reassess. The thing will go up, and then it'll start – or go down, and then

suddenly get "stick, stick, stick, stick, stick." Of course, as long as that tone arm is moving around, you go on running it. But it goes up and sticks, *gooohm, thud. Mm-mm.*

Now if you run a session over that, the pc becomes unassessable. You can't do anything to assess the pc. So you've got to stop it before you wreck the next assessment. That is the whole judgment on it. There is no other – no other judgment can be given you. And you'll see it, you'll see it sooner or later. By the way, the level you're running will still knock, but that's because the terminal knocks. You can still see the level knock, and then you reassess and it isn't there anymore. So don't bother about the level still reading on the needle when the tone arm is stuck after having run that level, because you'll continue to see it read.

Of course, the level is gone. You're just reading pure terminal. You're not reading the level anymore.

Okay. Well, there it is. I'm very satisfied with the way you've been going. I hope the few little remarks I've been making here will make it easier for you to do an assessment and carry on – feel more relaxed about it. And you, I think, should be able to get down here to an optimum assessment. I think the optimum assessment of a complete goals assessment and a complete run through 3D at the first time on a very expert auditor, a very, very, very good auditor who is a very fine expert who knows all there is to know about it on a goal that has never been found on a pc that's never had much auditing, something should be in the neighborhood of about twenty hours. So *speed up.*

I've only multiplied the factor about four. Suzie – Suzie can do one in 5.5 hours, so you should be able to do it in twenty. Okay? All right. So, tell me that you will do it in under a hundred, will you?

I mean the pc Clear, of course.

Thank you.