# ANATOMY OF PROBLEMS

A lecture given on
14 December 1961

All right. This is the what? 14th? 14th of Dec. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 1961.

Well, today we're going to cover the anatomy of problems. About time we had a look at problems and what they are and what they consist of. A problem is count – postulate-counter-postulate. Force versus force. Idea versus idea. Solution versus solution.

You have two people. And they're named Bill and they're named Joe. They're in collision with each other. They're having trouble. Maybe it's over a girl named Mary or a pot of gold. Who knows? But they're in trouble with each other.

How'd they get in trouble with each other? Remember they couldn't be in trouble with each other if they weren't in the same time stream. That'd be the first requisite. They'd have to be in the same time stream.

In other words, Bill would have to be able to talk to Joe and as well as Bill and Joe would be able to talk to Bill as well as Joe. Or, other words, he can talk to himself and he can talk to Bill. In other words, these people have got to be in the same instant of time, so they have to be in the same time continuum. That is the first requisite. That sounds very academic, but that is terribly important.

You'd say, "Well, how could they be in otherwise than the same time continuum?" Well, listen, knucklehead, this isn't the only time stream there is. Where'd you get so monomaniac?

Now, let me show you something. Do you realize that you, with your problems, are on a separate time stream from the physical universe and that's why you aren't in present time?

So right in the individual, right in the individual, we have two time streams. All right. Look it over. Don't look disgusted. If you're going to get disgusted with yourself, get disgusted with yourself, see. I didn't make you that way. I didn't.

Now, just look it over. Did you ever see a pc out of present time? Did you ever see him out of present time? Well, now, how do you suppose he got out of present time?

He must have started off in some instant of time that had to do with this same time stream, but he went on a spur line. Now, how did he manage to do that?

Well, during the middle of a race, he finds his watch is missing. He's down at the racetrack and there are horses and everything is going on and he's got two quid or five bucks on the nose of some dog and here he is. He's all set and he wants to know if – you know, he's going to check up on it to make sure that this is the right race and he reaches in his pocket and his watch is gone. It was bequeathed to him by his grandfather. Family heirloom. Matter of fact, his stock in trade. Every time he loses bets, he goes down to the pawnshop and hocks it until payday. This is a very important thing, this watch. So he loses it.

Well, while he is at the racetrack in a time stream called a race, he tries to go back to the time he lost the watch and therefore, on the subject of the watch, has a departure in time from this time stream. He starts running on a back time track while time goes forward that everybody agrees on, on this time track, see? So he's going backwards in time and then trying to do something about that time. And he isn't really trying to stop his time stream. All he is trying to do is to find out what happened.

A thetan has the facility of running on another time stream. Now, there is your most realistic example, if you look that over. Simply a branch of this time stream.

So he goes off sideways and starts worrying about it. And he has a problem now. And because he hasn't solved this problem very well, he tends to get stuck in it, but then he really gets stuck by solving it, see? He solves it. He becomes the foe of all pickpockets. And by remaining the foe of all pickpockets, then he won't again lose his watch. But he is already on a time stream which is slightly in disagreement with the time stream that everybody else is in. Because he's on a time stream which begins with the 1099 of a watch. And that is its beginning and then it, therefore, continues on forever, so to speak, because, of course, he started it. And it goes off and you normally refer to this sort of thing as a game or something It's a rather downgraded game if you want to get the facts of the case.

He goes off – one shouldn't lose watches. It is proven to him conclusively that watches can be lost. One should always be alert, then, to people who steal watches because there's this time at the racetrack when. And there's a little division there that he has set up and he tends to get hung up. Now, he actually isn't hung up in a moment of this time stream, but a moment. That is the exact instant of departure. The rest of the time he, of course, kind of makes time himself

It becomes an endless affair. This little tiny problem can float forever. It'd be undetectable in the huge mass of material in his reactive bank but nevertheless it's a little thread of time that is trailing along all by itself

You start running this pc and you – suddenly he goes *clonk, you* know and he isn't there and you can't get his attention. And you say, "What is this all about?"

And he says, "Oh, I don't know. I'm . . . Picture of a racetrack."

Well, what is he doing with a picture of a racetrack? Do you know that you and he are not at a racetrack? Did it ever occur to you that this is something odd?

Here you are. You're sitting in a room auditing and he's got a picture of a racetrack. Well, we already know he isn't there. We already know it's the not-thereness. You see, I'm only pointing out to you a phenomenon with which you are very, very familiar. But I'm giving you some of its genus. That racetrack, to the actuality that it exists in his mind, is. The racetrack is.

It's an object on another time stream. Because there's a racetrack there as a picture, there must be a time stream there if it connects a picture. He's perhaps progressing along very nicely in this moment of time, but he can at any moment then flick over and start progressing along another sort of a branch of time. I'll try to make it as real as I can to you.

All right. How about the fellow that didn't enter this universe at all? Have you had any problems with this person? No, have you? He never got here. He's never been on any part of your time stream and you've never met him. You never met him, you never heard of him. He isn't here. He isn't in this universe. He isn't on the time stream. He didn't even take off from the same spot you took off to enter this universe.

Can you have a problem with that man? He can never meet you. He can never talk to you. He can never have anything to do with you. You will never meet. The closest you will ever come to meeting him is my mentioning him. You going to have many worries about this man? You going to sit up all night worrying about him?

Well, (1) you've never had anything in common with him. And (2) you've never communicated with him. You've never been a friend of his. And (3) you've never had any overts against him or withholds. How can you have a problem? You can't.

So let's look over the anatomy of problems and let's find out that all problems have their own time stream. It must be a mutual time stream between the two ideas, the two forces, the two postulates, the two beingnesses. They must have a time stream in common.

They must also have a means of communication. Now, you may have problems with French taxi drivers when you run into them. I do. I overwhelm them. I create a means of communication. They don't want any communication. See, as soon as a French taxicab driver finds out that you're not going to speak – not French but Parisian – as soon as a French taxicab driver discovers this, he doesn't want you in his taxicab. That's pretty obvious. You say, *"Gare Nord," you* know, *"Gare Nord."*

And he says, *"Comment?"*

*"Gare Nord."*

So I create something that threatens to become a problem and I make him solve it. I show him we have a communication in common, which is a mean thing to do, you know.

There he is sitting there recovering nicely from his bottle of vin rouge for lunch, you know, and so on. And you put him to work. And he says, "American tourists," you know, "heh!"

I'm real mean. I point out his taxi meter, and I say, *"Taxi mètre? Taxi mètre? Comment? Eh?"*

And he finally says, "Yeah, that's a taxi meter."

I say, "Taxi? Taxi?"

"Yeah." And he finally agrees that's a taxi.

Then I say, *"Gare Nord ? Gare Nord ? Huh ?"*

And he has to agree I've said a railway station and takes me there. How would it happen otherwise? I had to demonstrate to him there was communication. It's very interesting Very interesting.

In a line of work which I have followed from time to time when there was low periods of employment, two armies mucking around and milling around and they don't speak the same language and the countries kind of in dispute and I'll tell you, they'll just maneuver forever. They will just maneuver and maneuver and maneuver until one of the generals gets very enthusiastic and fires a shot at the other one and *that* they can understand. That they can understand, you see?

I mean, they send out a patrol and the patrols clash. You ever follow these communiques that they were putting out in World War II and so on? You're always reading about the patrols clashing. I've often thought to myself that we could have had a perfectly restful, quiet war if people hadn't insisted on sending out patrols. I don't know why all these fellows had to go on patrols. I've talked to them occasionally, but they always seem to want to go on . . .

Anyhow, obviously, there couldn't be much of a war because actually one side speaks French and the other side speaks German. Now, you've been told that because one side spoke French and the other side spoke German that there was a war inevitable. That is not true. That would tend, if anything, to prevent a war. But they will communicate in means that each other can understand unmistakably, such as a patrol goes up and takes a Sten gun and starts firing. And that is the type of cause-distance-effect that even a general can understand. Obviously they are in communication.

The next thing that happens, there's a distinctly broadened view of patrol actions, so they send out more patrols and vedettes clash with vedettes – or something happens depending on what war, what planet – and the next thing you know they're in very, very good communication. They're breast to breast with swords, machine guns, mortars or whatever the period happens to be. They're communicating Cause-distance-effect. They are having an agreement. Look it over. They're having an agreement. The reason people on this planet don't

solve war very well is they always think of war as a disagreement. And war is not a disagreement. War is the tightest possible agreement.

A bunch of military men get bored in one country and a bunch of military men get bored in another country and they agree to have a war. And the politicians sit up there and can't figure anything out, so a war occurs. It's almost as stupid as this, but they get into communication. Somehow or another they get into communication about something And after they have this agreement, then they have problems.

Now, you've got the problems of logistics, casualties, propaganda, lying to the populace, figuring out good enough reasons as motivators in order to commit fantastic overts. See, all of those problems pursue from an agreement of some kind. But look, Germany and France couldn't have any war together at all if they weren't in the same time continuum. And then there couldn't be a war to amount to anything unless at some time or another they hadn't had a basic goal that was common to both of them.

Now, where you see an argument, there must have been an agreement. That is – that is just *ne plus ultra* fact. Where you see an argument, there must have been an agreement. The agreement could have been a very light one, but then there wouldn't be much of an argument. If the agreement was very light, the argument must be very light.

There must have been a fantastically heavy agreement to cause that much war. Now, I will give you a little – few cases in point. Some of the goriest wars which have ever been fought on the soil where we are at this moment had nothing to do with Napoleon and foreign invasion and all of that. It had to do with domestic issues. Man, they have really mowed them down. Civil wars of various kinds.

I don't think in Rome they ever had very much trouble with casualties on barbarian floods. But the barbarians eventually could no longer be stemmed. I think the battle was Messina. I wasn't there, but the Romans lost... I've forgotten the casualty figures. There are so many wars and so many casualty figures, but I think they lost something on the order of forty thousand of the pick troops of the Empire in a civil war.

And immediately afterwards they were heavily attacked by barbarians. And they had no front-line troops. That was the biggest single push the barbarians were ever able to make on the Empire and actually was thorough enough that it practically destroyed the Roman Empire. They would have been able to repulse this rather easily if they hadn't have been, for so many decades, so interested in civil war.

There's nothing quite as gruesome as a civil war. If you ever happen to be unlucky enough to be an officer or a sergeant or a private on the wrong side of a civil war, you've had it. Man, you've had it. Let me take a case in point.

Even after World War II, a private, sergeant, captain – it was unlucky to be a general. They were – they were trying those for war crimes, but this was new. Used to just execute them. Now they tried them. Something new. They're getting closer into agreement, more gentlemanly. But had you been one of these, at the end of World War II, a German, you would have gone home. Yes, you would have found everything messed up and so forth, but people left you alone. Nobody troubled you particularly. You were a vanquished enemy. And you settled down and made the best of it and so forth. And nobody thought very much about it.

But had you been part of the Roman Empire and had you been on the side of Marc Antony, who lost gorgeously, you wouldn't have been able to go back to Rome. And the state of the world at that time, you wouldn't even have been able to go out to the frontier because there hardly wasn't any. There was Rome and nothing else. You couldn't go home.

What happened to American officers in the Southern cause is a fabulous piece of history. All their lands were seized and so forth. They were treated like a bunch of criminals. They lost the war. That was their crime. But actually they were tried and lost their citizenship, lost everything. People never cease to be mean along this particular channel. People tended to leave the privates alone, but any noncommissioned or commissioned rank that had been a member of the Confederate forces caught hell.

What about this? It doesn't seem – seems to be rather odd, doesn't it? I don't know, you saw Indian chiefs. There'd be a big war and some Custer would stand up and get himself massacred, and *wow! crash!* And the next thing you know, why the chief is there at the White House or he's in an agency getting an issue of beef and everybody's shaking him by the hand.

"Yes, Sitting Bull, yes, I remember when. . ." you know and everything is fine. It's all right. But don't be the major that was in charge of the first attack at Gettysburg on the Southern cause, you see. You see, he was one of us. You get the idea? The *usness* of it. That's the *usness* of it all.

There has been a *tremendous* amount of agreement. There has been the agreement of common nationality, common language, common customs. And when you get a war out of that cauldron of super-agreement and super-ARC, man, it is a killer. It is a killer. There is never anything bloodier than a civil war. Never anything wickeder than an internal revolution. Boy, they just hang men and hang them and hang them till they run out of hemp and get tired.

The Russian Revolution – they didn't do much to the Germans. They stood around – I think the Germans had quite a war there during 1916 and so on. They used to run the Russian regiments into swamps and then sit around and play band music while the Russians perished in the swamps. I mean, it was a very exciting war. And when the Russians had totally folded up and nobody could keep them back in action again, they went home and they had a war. And that was quite a war.

If they had demonstrated anything like the amount of courage against the Germans that they demonstrated against their own people, they would have had it made and the Czar would still be there.

But they didn't. They went home and, man, they had themselves a war. My God! You read some of the internal battles of 1917, 18, 19, 20, 21, that occurred in Russia under the name, not of communism and revolution, but under the name of "We're all Russians, aren't we?" Really a blood bath. They never put anybody in prison camps. Wow, no.

That is simply a number of mentions of case histories and I think you can find it rather commonly true on the broad third dynamic front. And I'm certain you can find it true on the second dynamic front. Have you ever seen anything more vicious than a woman who has been fantastically in love with a man? And have you ever seen a man more bitter than one who has been deeply in love with a woman? Fantastic. And, boy, I think they would boil each other in vitriolic acid if they got a chance. There isn't any crime they wouldn't commit. Read your newspapers. Well, it works like that all the way along the line.

This is an old subject that I'm talking to you about. You're very familiar with it in Scientology, that an ARC break must follow ARC. That is an old subject.

But let's apply it to problems. And let's find that there couldn't possibly be a wild disagreement without there having been a solid agreement. Let's move that over on just a little bit more.

Let's find out we couldn't even possibly have a problem with somebody who wasn't in our own time continuum and with whom we had no communication. We must have had communication. And the problem is as grand and marvelous and explosive as there has been coexistence and agreement. It actually will establish the magnitude of the problem.

See, what everybody neglects on the German-French wars is the fact that the French are Germans. Everybody neglects this. The name of the country isn't France. I was a Roman too long to even much refer to it as France. It was called that after the Franks who came out of the woods just like the rest of the Germans, only they went a little further. And the ruling classes of France and the ruling classes of Germany . . .

You know, some of these wars we used to have around here on both sides of the channel were some of the most interesting wars you ever had anything to do with. Everybody that was on both sides was related to everybody else. There was hardly anything like nationalism. It hadn't been much invented yet. But there was certainly family. And you would find yourself lined up and all of a sudden there was your wife's brother, you see, in the enemy ranks.

Something like that. Well, this was liable to go one of two different ways, you see. It was either liable to be terrific hate involved and you'd go for him at once, depending on how

good the domestic relations had been, you see? Or in a lull in the battle, you'd see him over there and you'd say, "Hi ya, Joe. Bessie's okay these days," and go on your way, see? That was real mixed up. It was real mixed up.

Everybody was related to everybody else. And there is the fundamental agreement of the European war which has devastated Europe here several times in the last century. It's on the basis of the old agreement. And the old agreement was pretty solid.

Now, looking over all of this data, we find, then, that there might be a road out on the solution of a problem, on the recognition that a 3D is based on a one-time total agreement. One-time total agreement.

Now, as I was suddenly brought up short and given a blast of my own lectures – received a letter from, of course, it would be California – and somebody said, "Hey! What about games? What about the old rules of games?" I was very obliged to that letter because it's time I was reminded. Saved us a day or two. Because you remember about games. You remember about games?

The fellow was on both sides of the game? Pan-determinism, selfdeterminism and other-determinism. Remember these? You should. They're all over the place.

All right. Well, that's a game. And a person gets on one side of the game or the other side of the game to the degree that he has reduced his pandeterminism, has accepted other-determinism and considers himself to be operating on self-determinism.

There're always these three factors. It's choosing sides. Choosing sides. I can tell you by experience you can find an awful lot of war if you don't ever bother to choose sides. Honest. I'm not sa I'm saying it more or less as a joke because I've done it back on the track. Just be a casual observer and decide that – well, get upset about one side or the other and ride in on it. Up to that point, no interest in the matter. It certainly upsets people. Both sides practically turn on you, you see, because you're not part of the agreement that caused the war.

Nations, when they're at war, are always looking for the pan-determined party. They're looking for somebody with whom they can arrange an arbitration. It has to be an outside identity that can resolve a war. Therefore, it has to be an outside source that can resolve a problem. And that's the auditor.

Where 3D is concerned, you always have to have somebody standing outside who has no interest in either side. That's the auditor. 3D, of all things, is one of the roughest to have anything to do with on figuring it out yourself. I have absolutely no business to tell you that as a carte blanche fact because I myself, of course, have had to figure it all out myself, see? But I had to have outside help to the degree of somebody reading the E-Meter because – "Oh, *wow, ooo, no!"* – I couldn't even pick out the elements, see?

In other words, it was so involved, everything was so involved with everything that it was all self-determined or all other-determined with no pan-determined factors at all. Any time you would have shuffled me a card of – let's say, the forty or fifty items which interlocked on other 3D items, would have been the first view, you see. Actually a 3D looks to the pc like a minimum of fifty or sixty items before it's ever been assessed, you see? Nothing has ever been knocked off. No edges have ever been knocked off. Nothing has ever been unshuffled.

It may look like thousands to the first view, you see. There's just thousands of factors involved. But if he started to even it out, he would find out that there were forty or fifty vital factors that must be part of this 3D package. That would be for sure. Well, at this point, certainly an auditor would have to take over and assess these things. List them carefully and null them out and all of a sudden they start peeling off and you wind up with – well, you can wind up with six. You actually need only five. If you take an opposition goal, you could wind up with more than six. You could get the opposition goal to the opposition goal, you know and we could get the modifier to the – to the opposition goal. We – and you could get all these odds and ends that you didn't need. But you wind up with five of these things.

Well, that takes a lot of sorting. There's a lot of sorting out. It's a lot of pointed in that direction by the auditor. And the auditor does this, of course, by listing and assessing and he comes down with one item.

And the pc, up to that time, could have sworn there were forty, see. One item, you know, eh? When you finally get it down there, he's going sort of this way – you get it down with; you finally get it down there – and you say, "Waterbuck," you know. "That's it. Waterbuck."

He says, *"That's right."* Or he says, "Uh-uh, no. No. Hu-huh. That's the one it absolutely could not be." Either answer – you don't care which. Because it'll either be totally self-determined or tend to be totally other-determined. Notice this phenomenon.

Any item that you choose, finally, is liable to get one of three reactions from the pc.

He doesn't know and doesn't care which. Well, I don't know. That could be a wrong item. That could be improper. He just isn't lined up enough on the thing yet to see where it is. He's still grogged. He's had ARC breaks during the assessments. There'd be a lot of reasons perhaps why he would wind up in that state. That's the rarer state.

It's either self-determined or other-determined. It's either selfdetermined or other-determined. In other words, you say, "A waterbuck."

He says, "I'm a waterbuck" or "I'm against waterbucks."

Now, there's another one, see? He says, "I'm a waterbuck. They are waterbucks. I'm a waterbuck. They are waterbucks." He just does a flip-flop. See? You talk to him three seconds

after you've assessed the item. He says, "That's right. That's absolutely right. That's right. Absolutely. I'm a waterbuck. That's it. No doubt about it whatsoever."

And you say, "Good. We've got all that settled."

You haven't even got time, you see, to turn over your auditor's report or something like that and he says, "Well, I don't know."

And you say, "What do you don't know? What's the matter? You seem doubtful. You seem looking very doubtful."

"Well, I don't know whether waterbuck's it."

Ah. Oh, well, all right, okay. You're not going to argue with the pc. You've got it on the null list and if you know your E-metering, you know what it is. So therefore, you don't pay too much attention to this phenomena. But I call it to your attention so that you can observe it.

You say, "Well, that's all right," and you start to make a comment on the auditor's report.

And he says, "They're waterbucks." Got it figured out now. It's all satisfied.

So you end the session and he goes out in the hall and he says to somebody, "Us waterbucks." And he says to the person who is checking the thing, "Well, I'm not sure what it is. I don't know. I just got it assessed. I'm not sure at all what it is." They finish up and he says, "Aren't they a hell of a thing, a waterbuck? They're pretty awful, aren't they, waterbucks. Yeah, we've been against them for years."

Well, what's this? Well, this phenomena I'm talking about of the "I'm this side; I'm impartial; I am on the other side" is, of course, simply your dissertation on pan-determinism (a low-scale mockery of it), self-determinism and other-determinism. And those are the three factors always involved in a problem.

And you'll see the pc dramatize these when you get him in to – toward the Goals Problem Mass. And he dramatizes these things almost impartially and certainly with no criteria or good sense.

He might hang on to one of the elements three days. He might hang on to the element beautifully for three days. And he's just all set. And there's nothing wrong with this at all and then all of a sudden he doesn't know.

And then for another three days, he hangs on to the element that he's on the other side of it. "That's the right way it goes together, see. The right way it goes together is they're them and I'm me," and so forth.

And then he goes . . . He's had a long sleep and he's got some rest, so he woke up early in the morning and he didn't get out of bed immediately, unfortunately for the auditor and he runs off an hour or so of "I don't know."

"I really am something else, you know. I'm actually something else. There – there are the waterbucks and there are the tigers and I'm not either one of them. And uh – uh – that's right, I must have some other 3D element. There must be something else that I am, 'cause I'm obviously not a waterbuck. I'm obviously not a tiger. Sure. Must be something else. 'Cause I'm a... just impartial. I can get the point of view of a waterbuck. But why should I? I can get the point of view of a tiger, but why should I? I'm something else."

And he comes down and he sits down in session and he says, "Well, there's something about my 3D setup I meant to talk to you about," when you get withholds, see – you get the withhold. "There's something there I want to talk to you about," and so on. "Oh, no, no. There – there isn't any. No, it's just that I was thinking about it and I didn't – didn't quite see how, but I – I see now very clearly I'm a waterbuck."

And the end of the session, he knows he's a tiger.

Now, do you see, I gave you yesterday a number of elements involved. All right. And I told you the equivocal data concerning these. I can tell you now that you have only one real interest in this. It's just run the side that you can chip at the best. And if the case isn't progressing – this is all the importance there is to it – if the case isn't progressing, you haven't got a side the pc can confront. See, he can confront one side more easily than he can confront another side and you've chosen the side that he can least confront. And it's too high on the Tone Scale for his reality or something of this sort.

And as a matter of your running it, you are then running up against too powerful a situation. The pc is just sort of overwhelmed and so on. Well, did you ever run 8-C – I know a lot of you have – run 8-C on somebody to whom walls weren't real. Did you ever do that? And did you ever see the ease with which they can go around the room and swat the wall and walk around the room and swat the wall and walk around the room and swat the wall? And there's no change of comm lag, there's no change of pace, there is no change in the case, there's no change in anything.

Well, maybe you haven't done this second step, but I have had such a person and have gone into this rather searchingly and I found out that it was very easy to do because there weren't any walls there. Simple? "Anybody can run that one." No walls. So you're liable to get a pc into this kind of condition in the 3D. You're running him on that side where there are no walls.

Oh, yes, he knows of this terminal, yes. He's had trouble with this terminal. Oh, yes, yes, yes. So you run him *as* that terminal. And he has no reality of any kind whatsoever. He makes no advance. The winds of space blow his head off, but he'll go ahead and run it. He'll practically stand there and get himself cut to ribbons because it isn't real.

You'll find out that there are levels to be considered here. Now, if we were going to run out the whole package on just one side, this would then be very important, wouldn't it?

And it would be absolutely *vital* that we get the right side right now and that we run just that side and everything's going to go Clear on just that one side. Well, don't let me kid you about this. It could be that running the right side and the right levels and so forth, you don't get a chance to really clear the person because he goes Clear. You don't get a chance to work at it, you know? The needle goes up and sticks and goes up and sticks and blows down more easily and goes up and sticks and blows down more easily and is more easily and more easily and you go up and you try to make the thing stick and you can't make it stick and you can't make it stick and it just seems to blow down. And the first thing, you know, you can't read the meter. Well, I think that'd be a pretty horrible thing to have happen to anybody because you would have cleared somebody by accident. You wouldn't have had to work at it. But you can't always expect that to have happened.

The worse a pc is pushed into this Goals Problem Mass and the harder he is *emmeshed* in it, the less distinct it is to him that either side is real or he's liable to be tremendously *fixed* in one side and not at all fixed in the other side. And as you run him along the line he just has an awful hard time of it. That's all. They all have hard times of it and somatics at first, but this person just goes along for an awful long time before anything sort of busts up or surrenders.

Now, the main danger is that you can pick the wrong side for that pc on a pc that would clear rapidly and you run him so that it will take a longer time. It's in the interest of time rather than the interest of the destruction of the pc. Why?

Because the Goals Problem Mass is a problem. It is a problem and it's nothing but a problem, it's never been anything but a problem, but before it was a problem it was an agreement. And after an agreement, it became a game.

See, there was a – there was a time continuum and these two elements which make up the terminals and ideas which make up the 3D existed once, in their nucleus form, as a total agreement. First, they were in the same time stream. Second, they were in *perfect* communication. And third, they had tremendous agreement and goals on what they were doing. And all of these things they had in common.

And having had all these things in common, they now started to depart one from the other and eventually they got into a *game.* And they got into a very *thorough* game. And one side was shooting at the other side and they were all messed up and everything was all chewed up in all directions. And, boy, was it just coming to pieces in all directions. But it was a lot of fun and a lot of people got killed and it was sport and so forth.

And eventually this deteriorated as a game and became a problem. And as a problem, of course, it *stuck.* Well, as a game, it was sticky. And as an agreement, it was marching along the same time continuum.

Everything either party said, for a long, long period of time, was in total agreement with the other party. See, that was the first condition. And then the game? Why, they were in

total agreement on what game they were playing, too. There was still agreement in that warfare they were fighting one against the other, you see and that existed for a long time.

And then the game got pretty hectic and it came down scale and got very deadly. And having gotten very deadly, then passed over into a point where neither side were really playing a game and it was now a problem. But having originated with its own time continuum, it now continues right on up into present time as a Goals Problem Mass.

The easiest way to approach it, from the standpoint of most pcs, is to find that side that they can most easily fight. Find that side they can most easily fight. That will give them big case gains in the initial run. And to take the solutions off the top of the problem. Well, now, if you recognize that they were taking solutions off the top of the problem, you should also recognize that we have a long way to go after we've taken all the solutions off the top of the problem. We got quite a ways to go here, haven't we? Why throw the pc in over his head?

So the end of the game or, I mean, the end of the auditing is not the reaching, simply, of the end of the Prehav levels but could be expected to go on further than that.

There'd be other things. There would be distinctly other things you would have to do. Because what are you doing You're not taking apart a couple of terminals of which the pc is one. You have now got the selfdetermined-other-determinism softened up a bit. Just softened up a bit. And you still have to attain self-determinism for the other side for the pc and you still have to attain totally pan-determinism. All these things can be attained rather easily, but you should look on it as this: that the pc is on neither side. See, that's what the joke is.

All right. Let's take a waterbuck and a tiger. Pc's been waterbuck. Pc's been tigers. And the pc's been waterbucks. And the pc's been tigers. And before waterbucks and tigers were there, as enemies, the pc couldn't have told the difference between a waterbuck and a tiger: “Waterbucks? Tigers? They all have the same goal. We're just – we're just all in perfect agreement, us waterbucks and us tigers and us tigers and us waterbucks and . . .”

Somebody had walked up at that stage of the game and said, “You know, tigers are the natural enemy of waterbuck,” the waterbucks and tigers all would have looked up and they would have said, “That man's crazy. That man's insane.”

They couldn't even have grasped the idea of being different. Because they weren't very solidly waterbucks and they weren't very solidly tigers. This was the main thing. Their now-I'm-supposed-to's weren't congealed to that extent at that time. How did they congeal to that extent? Well, they started separating out of their package distinct characteristics that became *only* waterbuck characteristics and distinct characteristics which became *only* tiger characteristics. And then tigers started really getting characteristics and waterbucks really started getting waterbuck characteristics. And then they solved problems in different ways, eventually, at the final denouement. They play the game the same originally.

Waterbucks originally ate tigers and tigers ate waterbucks. They were indiscriminate. But eventually the tigers developed harder teeth and the waterbucks developed fleeter feet. And they differentiated so they had different methods of solving problems. And then they moved on up further and these different methods of solving problems didn't work very well and the game was deteriorating anyhow so they just – it just all came – became sort of regrettable. They had to do it.

You show a tiger to a waterbuck and the waterbuck knew exactly what he was supposed to do. And you show a waterbuck to a tiger and the tiger knew exactly what he was supposed to do. His now-I'm-supposed-to's were all ingrained in all those eons they were playing that game, you see? He knew exactly what he was supposed to do.

There mustn't be no hair of variation. It must be exactly this dramatization and this one is what we do. Now-I'm-supposed-to. "When we are presented with a waterbuck, if a waterbuck is standing there, we roll back on our haunches and we spring like this. And the spring length should be 9 feet, 3.7 inches. The proper place to bite a waterbuck is exactly back of the skull where the spine connects with the top of the skull. That's exactly. And at the moment of bite, we throw the head exactly that many degrees to starboard."

You ever stop to think of the fantastic now-I'm-supposed-to's connected into animals? Absolutely crazy. Once in a while you see a cat that won't wash its face. But it's very rare. That's very, very rare.

The now-I'm-supposed-to's. How did those now-I'm-supposed-to's get there? Well, they were specialized forms of self-determined survival that had nothing to do with pan-determinism. They had a great deal to do with other-determinism.

A cat knows exactly what they're supposed to do with a mouse. A mouse knows exactly what he's supposed to do with a cat. It's the darnedest now-I'm-supposed-to chain you ever saw. It's utterly invariable. Cruel as it is, it's utterly invariable.

Automobile drivers these days do not know exactly what to do. They are not plowed in to that extent. But you would eventually in a society, particularly a space opera type of society that was maundering along the track building shinier and higher structures and building punier and crazier men. And you'd – you'd get this thing eventually to a point where, "Well, we know what an automobile driver is. An automobile driver is supposed to slide under the wheel and he's supposed to do this and he's supposed to do that. And he can only drive a car that is 8.7 feet long and he must drive at a certain speed and when he sees another automobile driver who is in a slightly different position, he hits the right front fender in exactly that particular angle," and then – and it'd be the now-I'm-supposed-to's would just go crazy on the subject, you see.

You're already building up fabulous now-I'm-supposed-to's. Children are not supposed to look at cars, see? They're not supposed to. They're supposed to look up and down before

they cross the road to see there are "no cars." See? In the absence of cars, they act. In the presence of cars, they mustn't act. I mean, we're building up quite a hierarchy on the thing. And it's not a very good one. It is pretty wowzy.

The vehicle departments of every country on Earth have now-I'm-supposed-to's. "A person comes up. If he had paid his taxes and he signs on the right line and if he gives us the right number of shillings and if he can tell red from green and if he has a depth perception of so-and-so, we then give him the license and then he goes down and he climbs in the car and then we make sure he can take the car around one block and shift the gears properly and then we turn him loose and he goes down the road and he kills somebody and . . ." They know what they're supposed to do. Try and shake that pattern. Try and shake it. Try to keep a beaver from building dams.

See, he's not going to do anything with that. You're building it in the rock. So the society on the third dynamic is going together on these animalistic impulses similarly. All these come out of games. They come out of agreements. The agreement becomes a game. The game becomes a problem. And in that problem, now, you have the characters and dramatizations – total fix self-determinisms.

Now, the reason you see your pc shift around from one side to the other is because you're auditing your pc. Because you have already done a terrific amount of auditing on the pc just by listing and nulling – see, listing and nulling of items. That's a tremendous amount of auditing.

So you're looking at a pc whose now-I'm-supposed-to's are shook up like a dice in a box or like Elvis Presley.

These things are just *bzzzzz* already, see? No, he didn't have any doubt in his mind before you started this or before he was ever audited – if you take a period long before he was ever audited on anything. Auditing in general does these things. And just examine what his conduct was, if you could get a clear picture of it after you shook it up.

Wow, my goodness! You take him back there and "Waterbuck? Be a tiger? No. Nobody would ever even dream of suggesting to a waterbuck that he might be a tiger." He had certain definite responses toward tigers and tigers had certain definite responses toward him. He knew *exactly* what he was supposed to do. He knew *exactly* what he dreamed about. He knew *exactly* what he hoped for. You pushed the top coat button and he went *clink, you know*? It's just an automatic stimulus-response mechanism. He's just a wound-up doll. He just *pang, pang, pang.*

You gave him the proper stimulus, you get a response. And the response was a dramatization of the Goals Problem Mass.

All right, you've busted the hell out of this. You've knocked this to pieces. You already listed and assessed. You got this thing getting into view and the pc may dramatize it suddenly and dramatize it very hard and then not dramatize it and dramatize it and not dramatize it and then dramatize the other side and then dramatize it the way they did originally and then dramatize the other side and then not dramatize it. And then know there's something else and their 3D must be wrong

There's no question in their reactive mind as to whether they were right or wrong, don't you see? There was no faintest question in their reactive mind as to whether they were right or wrong before you started auditing this package. There was *no doubt.* Must be wonderful to live with no doubt. It must be absolutely phenomenally marvelous to be completely certain, no matter how psychotic the principle, to be completely certain of it. That must be a marvelous sensation.

If you want to know how marvelous it is, go down to the insane asylum someday. Those are the most certain people on Earth. And there's nothing ever changes their minds about anything. They know there's a fire burning in the courtyard. You could take them out, you could show them the courtyard, you could show them there's absolutely not a stick of wood in the courtyard. You could show them there isn't a whiff of smoke in the courtyard. You could show them the courtyard is absolutely clean, perfect. They go back in. They say, "You see? Fire in the courtyard."

Nothing, no proof of any kind ever makes any impression on it. No experience of any kind ever makes any impression on it. Man knows he's supposed to go off a fifty-five-foot high dive board into the concrete. He knows that's the thing to do. So he goes up the fifty-five foot, he goes off into the concrete. It doesn't matter how many times he does it, nothing ever teaches him that he shouldn't do it.

You say to him, "Hey, it's concrete. You remember the last time you did it, you spent eight months in the hospital."

"Yeah," he says, "That's right. That's right. That's right." Walks right straight up the ladder. Goes right straight off the board, fifty-five feet into the concrete.

Now, I'll show you where there are some now-I'm-supposed-to's of this magnitude which aren't in the insane asylum but in the animal kingdom. Migratory birds here and there and butterflies and lemurs all various parts of the world, will suddenly know what they're supposed to do. And they go down to the beach and swim out to sea till they drown. And scientists sit around and they try to figure this out. "Was it that there was once an island out there? Highly probable, you see." Or it was something or other.

But we know for certain one thing about it. That they've got a now-I'm-supposed-to that at a certain season of the year after so many years they're all supposed to go down to the beach and go into the surf on the compass point of north-northwest or something and start

swimming and just keep on swimming. Or the butterflies are all supposed to do this or they're supposed to do that. And it doesn't matter how suicidal this thing is. They're all supposed to do it. Well, it's part of some old problem and earlier than that some old game of some kind or another and earlier than that some old agreement.

Well, you've got your pc assessed or a pc is nicely assessed, we've got a 3D package. It's all laid out. It's all beautiful. And now we're going to go through the oddity of trying to find out which side the pc is on.

Now, let me – let me point this up to you. If you choose the right side, it will be that side which the pc can run with benefit. And that's all that's right about it. There's nothing else right about it. It's the side he can most easily run with benefit. It's the side which he can run best to run out somatics. It's the side that he can run best in order to buck the Goals Problem Mass and start shooting it as full of holes as Swiss cheese. That's the side.

It's not that the pc *is* that side because the pc is equally the other side. And the pc is also neither side. At any given instant, the truth of the matter is that the pc is neither one and is capable of being both – and *is* both. And both sides are equally other-determined to him. But one is higher than the other on the Tone Scale and therefore probably easier to view as an ally and much harder to buck in auditing

But the pc has used both sides down through the ages until he has eventually gotten to a point where he has so many overts on himself while he was a waterbuck, you see, that these overbalanced and he became only a tiger.

Now, your first attack on a 3D package, then, is simply the "only." You're trying to establish as much as you can the only onlyness of it. What is the only onlyness of it? That's all. I mean where is the preclear the most only. The only only. See, is he mostly waterbuck at this moment? Does he think of himself mostly as waterbuck at this moment?

But we don't even care what he thinks. Which is the easiest side to run? Well, it would normally be the side which is the least high-toned. The lower-toned side having already been caved in a bit, of course, is more susceptible to attack. So if you run the pc *as* it, you get – because of the trick of the commands, you get more attack against the weakest part of a Goals Problem Mass. So, therefore it runs and it runs more mass and it runs more flows, and it's easier for the pc to handle and only half kills him.

The other side may almost totally slay him, you see or no reality at all. "Tigers? I never had anything to do with tigers. Problem with a tiger. Oh, combing his hair, I guess. I suppose that would be. You see, I've had very little experience with tigers. Only during half the duration of the Goals Problem Mass have I been a tiger. I've had very little experience with tigers."

Tiger is too high-toned on the scale. He can't attack the tiger. He doesn't think of himself as capable of attacking a tiger. So he just sort of not-ises the whole thing

"Well, there are tigers. You expect me to attack this? Huh, well, I can sit here attacking this tiger and it's so comfortable, you know." Because tigers don't exist. Naturally, it's comfortable.

Well, the pc will actually move himself into this position and get his fool head blown off because you can't help – with that high power a command, you can't help but turn on something And all of a sudden, why, the pc isn't getting any somatics. The pc doesn't feel mentally very upset, but the pc's starting to look sort of wild-eyed and their skin starts turning black and their eyes look like they're being pushed through the back of their head or something like this and it's not a comfortable position to be in, because you're not running the easiest levels for them to run and you're not running the side which is the easiest side to confront and you're not running any part of the situation which is an attackable quarter.

It's something like, you're sitting there, you got a perfectly good army and there's one part of the castle which is ten times as high as the rest of the castle and has been very well cared for and the mortar is in marvelous condition and it's totally impossible to scale it. And there's another part of the castle that the walls are all fallen down into the moat and it's a bunch of stuff that any schoolboy could wiggle through, you see? And your only crime as the auditor is saying, "All right. You see that beautiful high tower over there? Climb it and take the castle," you see?

And the pc – he tries. He tries. It's just awful high. No castle is that big Whereas you might just as easily say, "See that breach over there in the wall and see that moat? It's perfectly easy to walk across that. You attack it over there."

And the pc goes over there and he has a hell of a time. He gets his hands all cut to pieces on the briars and he gets all muddy in the moat and he just gets all messed up. My God, you'd think there was – it was a – World War VII was going on, to hear the pc sometimes. But there's something happening There's obviously something happening He eventually crawls through the breach and walks into the castle. Looks at the back side of this thing and oddly enough the huge towers that are up there so imposing and so forth, have a back side that is held up with rotten rope. The thing starts going *creak, you* know. *Creak.* And it's the kind of condition that once you're inside it, don't sneeze, boys. Don't sneeze because the E-Meter will stop reading. It'll start floating

You get the – you get the difference of view here? That's about the – that's about the best breakdown I could give you on the conditions of the problem. Of course, I give these to you in relatively comprehensible attack-defense-retreat lines. But you can easily send a pc up against a job which looks sufficiently big to them and sufficiently impossible to them that all

it looks – although it looks not dangerous, it's just too big. And they'll go ahead and work on it and they get no place and you don't make much of a gain and so on.

The odd part of it is, even so, if you kept attacking that particular tremendous amount of spires and everything else, something would happen. You can't do nothing about it. I mean, something will happen. It just won't happen as fast, that's all. It's going to be uncomfortable and it's going to be unreal. And you're going to be provoked because the pc is liable to ARC break more easily. He knows he's being sent up against too many piles of manuscript paper. You know, he, *"Yeeeeees,"* looks pretty terrific to him. But he'll sit there and go along with it.

"Well, if you say so. If you say, well, that's the way it is, well, guess so. If that's the way it is, why, all right, I'll attack it. Of course, I know it isn't there."

He has an odd frame of mind. He doesn't get this factor known as reality out of it. So that is the liability. That is the basic liability of choosing the wrong side on one of these things.

All right. Well, what do you do about one of these things? Could you just blow one of these things up? No, I don't think so. I think in the early stages of the run, if you were to ask the pc what he thought of just blowing all of this up or wiping it all out at one fell swoop, he would go into an awful confusion. He just hasn't got it differentiated enough. He just isn't used to the idea at all for him to do very much about it. He just – well, I don't know. He's not even hardly used to the terms. He's not even hardly used to the new state of "What? I'm a waterbuck," you know. "Me a waterbuck, waterbuck."

He's still in the process of laughing at himself every time he sits down to dinner and won't drink any water, you know? And right about this time, you say, "All right." Sweepingly to him, "All right. Well, I'll tell you what let's do. Let's just – let's just find the genus of this whole thing and then let's wipe it all away, huh?"

Well, look, let me call to your attention that he couldn't attack one side of the problem because it was too big for him to find it real. What do you think his reaction is going to be to just wiping out the whole thing? Well, that's just about seven times as unreal.

And actually early in a run on 3D, the idea of this game ever ceasing or the idea of this game ever having an end is preposterous. And also, it's also preposterous that the game ever had a beginning Game never had any beginning. *Ha-ha.* Been going on forever.

"I suppose at one time or another I have played this game," as an attitude varies with the fact this game has been going on forever and ever and ever and ever.

Now, in view of the fact that there are confusions back on down the line that tend to bang the pc up on the anatomy of problems, you know, you find the prior confusion to the problem, you tend to move up into the problem. Well, you keep auditing this thing, you keep hitting prior confusions of one kind or another and it tends to bang the pc up toward present

time. So the track to him for a while looks shorter and shorter and **shorter and shorter** and he thinks maybe he was only a waterbuck for one lifetime, you know.

Well, maybe last life he was a waterbuck. Yeah. Only once. And then again this starts to broaden out and he cycles back on the thing. And the next thing you know, he's telling you, "You know, I think I was a waterbuck before they invented this universe." See, you get a variation of the two extremes.

Well, there's no doubt his having been a waterbuck for a very, very, very long time. There's no doubt about that at all. But there's also no doubt about the fact that he might find this too beefy to attack.

My diffidence in approaching this as a full and complete layout and so forth, does not stem at all from the fact that it can't be beaten. This is easy to beat.

It stems entirely from the basis of the easiest way to beat it. You see me looking around and shifting it around here and there and so forth. Because I want you to find an easy win.

Now, I know these facts – that it'd be utterly impossible to get under the Goals Problem Mass and just go bang I should think that over a period of over a month or two you could do this. You could take pieces of it that the pc can find – conflicts of it – and date them on the E-Meter and get the whole track plotted on the subject for a month of sessions. And by that time the Goals Problem Mass would look like a Swiss cheese that somebody had taken a shotgun to. That's just by the process of pinning it on the time track and getting it aligned and getting the data and getting the ball unraveled and that sort of thing.

During that period of time, you would never have had to have discovered which the pc's side was on. You would not have done anything You'd have said something or other.

"Now, we've been talking about this a little while. Do you have any pictures of a – of a tiger and a waterbuck? Do you have any pictures of this and so forth?"

"Yes, well, I've got one here."

"All right. Let's date it."

I mean that type of dating. Let's find out when that occurred on the time track. Let's pin it down. A lot of other things will come off of it and we eventually – remembering to work with just the one picture, not trying to date the rest of the stuff that came up – get the one picture on the time track. And we just build that time track back.

I tell you that that is a totally feasible method of clearing somebody. That's totally feasible.

Teaching you how to date? Sometimes when I have tried, I think it's impossible. But that's just me being snide. You could learn how to date rather easily. Most of you know how

to date on an E-Meter. But I'll tell you, years ago in teaching people how to date on an E-Meter laid in enough overts and withholds on my part, you see, that I get a weariness when I think of going into it. I think of some student coming here who doesn't know anything about dating on an E-Meter and I think of having to put him through all of the ropes of dating on an E-Meter with his own bank in the road and it makes me tired, that's all.

I'm trying – I'm joking now, but I'm actually trying a bit not to add this additional skill because this is quite a skill. You get all mixed up with A.D.'S and B.C.'S and years ago and they run into implants and you run into this. And then the implants have got in them 176 thousand years, you see, 176 thousand years. "It was 176 thousand years ago. Well, this doesn't – this isn't working out." The poor auditor almost goes mad. And eventually the thing, if it's ever solved, turns out to be an incident which has the figures 176 thousand years ago in it. And the incident is 8 billion years ago. And he eventually gets this kind of stuff separated out and so forth.

But remember that, that is a very feasible, proven tool. That is a very proven tool. You can do fantastic things with getting incidents back on the time track and aligned with the pc.

There's another one. You can find every confusion. You can find every confusion that might precede any stuck picture the pc has on the problem of the waterbuck versus the tiger. Prior confusion. Then find out what the person was at that time and what they did. And you, of course, would run that problem by prior confusion. We're now talking, not about – . You're not talking about infinite auditing, you see? I'm talking about – in terms of what we were thinking in terms of a few years ago – we're talking in terribly rapid auditing. And this again would be quite feasible. It would be quite feasible in dispensing with the Goals Problem Mass.

Now, what I am working with right at the present time is simply this. I want the pc to run the easiest side of it for the pc to attack.

In other words, I want the pc to run that terminal which is the easiest for the pc to attack himself. And you'll find out this will turn on no winds of space. It turns on masses. It gets rid of the somatics. It causes the tone arm to go up and stick easily, that falls down, the needle gets looser and looser and it straightens out and so forth.

All right. Now, that takes a bit of a time to run. That takes a little while to get all of that squared away.

I don't at all worry about somebody running on the wrong side of a 3D. I'll just level with you. Except I have peculiarities. I like people to look pretty and running on the wrong side of the 3D makes you look like a mud pie.

I remember one night, Suzie assessed me on the wrong terminal we just – just for fun, you know. And she can tell you I looked like I had a parted skull when she finished off and so on. Quite interesting.

The oddity on such a thing is that there should be an easy road in and out. That is the oddity. And you are given that oddity that there is an easy road through it by the mechanics of assessment, the accuracies of the E-Meter, the oddity of having invented a Prehav Scale and the oddity of the command package of the 28th, 29th, 30th November 61 and 7th December. These are oddities. Those command packages are quite fantastic.

Do you know those things have been separated out from every type of command? You talk about work, man; you really make me work. You know those have been separated out from every type of command that have ever been used for eleven years? God! Don't think that wasn't a – that wasn't a sweat getting those things straight. That command pack was fantastic.

The command package now only becomes nonfunctional when you've got the wrong level. It'll become very nonfunctional if you've got the wrong level.

The pc gets this wonderful problem, you know. He's sitting there, he's very happy. He gets this wonderful problem. "Yes, well, how to take the throat out of a waterbuck the most painfully. *Aaaaah, yes, as I think most painfully."*

And the auditor says, "How might smell be a solution to that problem?"

Pc has been made wrong, of course. See, the level either was flat – the level was flattened or misassessed or something like that, see – but mostly probably flat.

Another thing is what's wrong with that particular package, as I've already told you, that the word *problem* or *difficulty* or *trouble* or *confusion* or whatever you're using there – "Tell me a (blank) – can itself move the tone arm. And you could omit the even-numbered commands. "How might (Prehav level)?" You wouldn't get anyplace doing this, by the way. I mean, the thing would go nowhere. Well, you're looking at about a thousand-hour run.

But you'd get a – you could say, "Tell me a trouble that you might have **had with a tiger.** Tell me a trouble you might have had with a tiger. Tell me a trouble a tiger might have had with you. Tell me a trouble a tiger might have had with another tiger," you see. And just by that – you know, just by doing that, doing that, doing that, doing that – you're going to get some motion on the tone arm. That's for sure. It's going to be a rather endless proceeding, but you're going to get some motion on the tone arm.

Remember the old process "Tell me a problem. Tell me a problem. Tell me a problem?" or "Tell me a problem similar to that problem," or a problem of comparable magnitude or some such process as that, will handle present time problems quite nicely. Don't try to handle a Goals Problem Mass with it, however, without the booster of the Prehav Scale

immediately behind it because the pc *is* obsessively solving these problems with that level of the Prehav Scale.

And if you haven't run out the level it works. But the level, of course, could go flat or you could get a new level too soon. In other words, the very errors which you're trained not to make, if they were made, would produce a zzzzz on the part of the pc, so it has to be done rather – rather neatly.

Well, all of these things simply add up to a knock through the wall, that's all. I mean, we're doing fine with this sort of thing

Now, characteristically – as I've done all year – all I'm trying to do is shorten the thing down and make it more positive. Shorten it down. Make it more positive. Shorten it down. Make it more positive. Work on this rather consistently. And at the same time, try to make it simpler for the auditor.

I can tell you a gimmick, now, which would be an interesting gimmick. If you made a list of the number of goals which the term and oppterm had in common, see – if you just listed that. Or on what points would the terminal and the oppterm be in complete agreement? See, that would be another approach. Or what game – and this would be a latter, more complicated thing and is probably your best entrance because it's more complicated and later, you see. After you're done with solutions to the problem and so forth, if you suddenly said, "Well, now, what game would . . . " – it'd be some process which would amplify this, see but – "What game would a waterbuck be likely to play with a tiger and a tiger with a waterbuck?" And you just keep the guy listing games and game situations, of one kind or another and eventually you'd run the center of that track out.

In other words, these are all approaches to shorten up the run on the Goals Problem Mass. But they all presuppose that the thing has already been straightened out and that Prehav runs have more or less got the thing fairly well into perspective for the pc and the pc has gotten over his worse somatics on the situation and the hardest part of the road has already been traveled. Those things presuppose, then you have these other approaches of this particular type.

And do you see why? Because you're not trying to establish the selfdeterminism of a waterbuck. You are not trying to establish the otherdeterminism of a tiger. You are not trying to establish the self-determinism of a tiger. And you are not trying to establish the otherdeterminism of waterbucks. These you are not trying to do.

You're trying to establish the pan-determinism of a thetan who has gotten so biased that he can't tell a good action from a bad action because the now-I'm-supposed-to's all fit in this exact pattern and he has some game running here which has amounted eventually to an insurmountable problem which has given him his total package of now-I'm-supposed-to's so that he can't *breathe.* And hardly anybody has pointed out to him that there haven't been any

waterbucks and tigers having a game for some time in these particular climes or that it isn't much of a game or it's a very serious game. And you point out to him, "Well, yes, that's a very interesting game, but I understand you haven't played it for eight lifetimes."

"Well, no, but on the other hand, I might. You never can quite tell when the pterodactyl is going to come back." He's very outmoded. But his pandeterminism has been submerged and having been submerged, he, of course, is being obsessively self-determined which *pins* him thoroughly on a dynamic. And he's no longer loose on the dynamics. He's *clank* on the dynamics.

His idea of the dynamics are the exact now-I'm-supposed-to's given to him for identity package which is either the term or the oppterm or whatever it else is. What – whichever one he's stuck in.

Now, in view of the fact that he can be the terminal . . . If he could ever be a pure terminal, we have no objections to a pure tiger. But he isn't. He's a tiger with the mores, sometimes, of a waterbuck. And sometimes isn't either one. And he's a tiger with a special goal that isn't necessarily the goals of tigers. And he has an opposition goal which triggers him – which upsets him terribly – such as "you mustn't eat long grass." And all the more – all the poor gardener has to do, all the poor gardener has to do, is leave the grass for three days too many, you see and the grass threatens to get a little bit long and we've got somebody who is dying in the house from psychosomatic rages of one kind or another but who doesn't even know he's mad at the gardener and doesn't even know it has anything to do with the grass.

And I could say this state of confusion is well worthy of being straightened out. I think that in itself is a big game.

Now, you have had this long enough to realize, of course, that a 3D does exist. I think you think a 3D does exist. I think you've looked around long enough to find out that there are some parts to the 3D and that they have some influence on people's lives. That's about as faint as I could state the certainty on it.

But these things, when properly found, make up, first, a problem . . . You see, of course, a solution when you first look at the pc. Everything he's doing is solutions. You don't see any of the problem. He's solution, solution, solution. And the next thing you see is problem. Problem, problem, problem. And when you get the problem peeled off, what are you going to see? You're going to see game, game, game, game.

It'd be very dangerous for you to continue to go into an agreement with the pc over how bad tigers are. Well, he's going to turn on you about threequarters of the way down the run and you're going to have an awful ARC break and you're not going to be able to get him in-session and you're going to find out – you're going to say, "Well, what's the matter?" and you're going to get all your rudiments in. You never think to ask him about terminals.

By the way, I've already discovered just one little flub on that. Not much. But you're not realizing that what makes the pc's tone arm go up is a break of mores of the terminal, a break with the mores of the terminal. It's not a break with the mores of us or the society. Mores get busted up on the terminal.

The person does something that the terminal wouldn't do. And having done so, you get a rise of tone arm. And then you look for it according to the code and mores of our present modern times and of course, you can't discover why the tone arm went up between sessions.

Person went to bed and went to sleep. No reason for the tone arm to go up. Terminal, "cat burglar." Get the idea? Why, you get a raised tone arm every time between sessions.

And you say, "Make sure you go to bed now and go to sleep quietly," and he comes back and the tone arm is up. "Well, what did you do between sessions?"

"I went to bed and went to sleep."

You say, "Well, then, he didn't do anything between sessions."

No, he did nothing but refuse to dramatize his terminal. Or he did something that was contrary to the terminal, which is to say he went to bed and went to sleep. And what is a cat burglar supposed to do? Ha-ha. That's something else. No self-respecting cat burglar was ever found home in bed at night calmly sleeping

We find a girl, terminal unknown, tone arm flies up. *Flang!* Between sessions. And you say, "What did you do?"

Well, all right. It's very hard to get that tone arm down because you don't know the terminal. But let's say we know the girl's terminal. We say the tone arm went up between sessions and comes back in the next session and we say, "What did you do?"

She says, "Nothing I had a talk with Bill last night and uh . . ."

"Well, what – what did you have a talk with Bill about?"

"Well, nothing We got everything all settled. I was going to be faithful to him, and he was going to be nice with me and so on. And it all went on all right."

You – you knucklehead, say well, that's the way they're supposed to act, so therefore there's no reason for the tone arm to go up. But the terminal is nautch girl. Faithful to Bill, of course, would be a total break with the mores and now-I'm-supposed-to's of a nautch girl. They just busted it to flinders. So the tone arm is up. What you might call a terminal objection.

All right. Well, you see these things in passing and you can audit them, but I'm trying to show you exactly where we are and what we're going toward. And in view of the fact that I'm riding on a little bit of slack time, in that I'm still trying to find out here and there exactly what's a more comfortable side to run on some of these terminals, and so on – got most of

them going all right – we've got the little slack time of knowing how to clean up the game aspect of it. By the time you get there, I'll have it.

Thank you.