

# TERMINALS

A lecture given on  
15 November 1962

Thank you.

Well, how are *we*, tonight? Doesn't that sound cute. Of course, that is referring to you and your valences.

This is lecture one, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. What's the date?

*Audience: 15 November.*

Nov. 15, AD 12.

And there's another item that's posted on the bulletin board, has to do with one R. – I think it is – R. M. Nixon. You notice that on the bulletin board? And John is attributing the fact that we clobbered Nixon to the fact that he's clobbered. I don't know to what point this extends, but it's interesting that that is the first political figure in the United States that we really have clobbered. Of course, we hit him hard.

Mary Sue isn't here. Mary Sue isn't here, so I can tell you that actually I hit him because he hit at Mary Sue. It's almost that corny. But this fellow was using the United States Secret Service as a sort of a private Gestapo. And he'd been doing this all over Washington and so forth. So I just didn't think it was good political – I didn't think he had the right political color, somehow or another. I thought that ...

But you notice this sort of thing happening, that after country A has defeated country B, you will see not just the spoils of war but the customs of country B showing up in country A. Very interesting thing, here, you see?

Now, actually, almost anybody unwittingly will take on the color of his oppterm. That's horrible to behold, but true! Now, I want you to become very expert with that bulletin on somatics – last week's bulletin on somatics. For this reason: is, people tend to rank themselves individually as the cowboys in the white hat. And the oppterm as the cowboy in the black hat. And the only thing that tells you which is which, is whether it turns on pain or sen. You see? Turns on pain, when you chant it one way or the other, as per that bulletin, why, you get – that's a terminal. And if it's – turns on sensation, why, of course, that's an opposition terminal.

Well, they're quite distinct. But remember, as in the case of a rock slammer, you have

separated them. You have already differentiated it for the pc. And now he sees what the score is. But some people also work this in reverse. They consider themselves only the cowboy in the black hat, you see, and the enemy always is the cowboy in the white hat. All of which is quite amazing. And they will get terribly tangled up. And if you get an oppterm on the terminal side, or a terminal on the oppterm side, the consequences of it is great confusion.

Now, when you get one that turns on both pain and sen, you mark it in the middle of your line plot as a combination terminal. They're quite legitimate, and it merely says that you got hold of a deteriorated package. It isn't that this package has collapsed. It's that we now have a new terminal which has the attributes of both terminal and oppterm. You see, it's a sort of the end of the road. Pain and sen turn on with that. Well, that's a combination terminal. Recognize it. It's not a package which has just pushed itself together, it is a new thing which belongs as a lock on both the oppterm chain and the terminal chain. In other words, he's picked up a new identity which had both their characteristics.

When we get into national life – to revert to what I was talking to you about – you get the succeeding generations of politicians performing as combination terminals. You see, you're looking there at combination terminals. The war happens in generation A, and then in generation B we tend to get a combination terminal, see. So the US busily defeats Germany and there'd be a tendency up where – somewhere up the track to – somebody to have a democratic fascism. This all logical, see, we have a democratic fascism. It's perfectly all right for democracy to exist as long as we're capable of also operating the Gestapo.

Well, it's that sort of thing that I tend to keep an eye on. But of course, you may not realize it, but you're all members of a secret society. You've been a member of it for a very long time, most of you. And it doesn't matter whether this shows up in your oppterm line or not, sooner or later, why, you pick it up on the track. And that's the “SPG.” The “SPG” – it is very nice. And you're authorized, you know, to enlist anyone as a member of the “SPG.” There are no dues, only performance is expected. And the “SPG,” of course, is the “Society for the Prevention of Government.” Of course, any time you natter about your income tax or something like that, you to some degree are preventing government, don't you see. So you willy – nilly are members of this organization; you might as well go in whole hog, you know.

I find it quite interesting that man hasn't realized yet that government is the source of his wars, see. They haven't taken that one extra step. Man as a whole. But the other day I was quite interested to receive an invitation to become a member of a board of people who were being recruited, willy-nilly, any way possible, to make a consultation panel that should get together and figure out what should be done with governments and man and atom bombs, and all this organization, this society, that's putting this out is doing – it's quite interesting – it's quite interesting – all they've decided to do is just get a bunch of fellows together, see. They haven't postulated any solution. They're trying to get together a bunch of fellows who will correspond with one another and meet with one another, in the hopes that these boys will

come up with some kind of an idea or a solution. And all they're taking responsibility for is putting all these people in contact with one another. And they've picked up a few hundred people around the world, and they're now busily trying to get them into communication with one another. That's all they're doing, see.

Well, they haven't stated it, but they realize themselves that this idea of government, you see, is – must be at the cause of it, because they haven't approached governments. I thought it was very interesting, see, that somebody would actually take this effort. Apparently they're spending quite a bit of time and money on it and so on, and that is the total purpose of it. There is no other purpose, except let's get these fellows together and get them talking to one another and get them writing one another and they may come up with a solution. And then we'd be very happy to publish the solution. That's the totality of it.

Now, of course, I was worrying about this a few weeks ago. How come government would get into this kind of a mess? Well, naturally, war and antagonism and that sort of thing gets these things going. And then some very pure government – is doing a very good job – tackles some government which is doing a degraded job of some kind or another, and afterwards we get a combination terminal, you see, and the thing isn't – the first government wasn't quite so pure, now, you see. Now we get this compounding up the line, and combinations of this sort of thing, and we eventually get what we now got.

Now, the essence of this thing is that I wondered why was it that government would occupy so much of people's attention and newspaper space, and I suddenly realized that government has a salesman but the individual does not. See, the individual does not have a salesman. You're supposed to personally erase yourself, you know, even in common social courtesy. You don't have to go as far as the Japanese, you see, but you self-negate. You know. You mustn't blow your own steam or sound your own horn – that sort of thing, you know. But governments have spokesmen. And every politician that runs for office is selling the idea of government. And that is the chief idea which is being sold. And it's sold now by radio and television – completely aside from soap boxes, and so forth. And everybody is supposed to get out and buy this idea, certain number of times, and vote, and all that sort of thing, you see. It's a heavily sold idea.

And of course, a democracy has got it worked out to a fine-feathered fury, you see. Everybody is persuaded that they choose their leaders, you see, and therefore it's the people's fault, which of course makes no government. If the head of government – it isn't the head of the government's responsibility to find out what's going on and do the right thing, but the people's fault. But the people have no say about who's the head of government, really, you see. That's a mess.

Anyway, it's the only supersalesmanship that is now going on. And man, it is supersalesmanship. Everybody is selling this idea. So of course you get more and more and more and more government. And you're going to get more and more and more and more

government, see. So eventually the individual becomes nothing, the government becomes all. And you get some sort of a communistic, socialistic supermess of some kind or another, where nobody must spit without asking permission of the government and, you know, have a license to breathe, and all that kind of thing. And I worked this out. You might think that government is one of my oppterms; doesn't happen to be. That's why I can still think on this subject.

It's interesting to me, though, that you collide with government on this single front and basis. The only time you find something wrong with the idea of government is because you are selling the idea of the individual. Unwittingly, willy-nilly, whether you have ever expressed it to yourself or not, you are still selling the idea of the individual. I consider this quite interesting. Now, because you can make things better by handling the individual, of course, you fall into the channel of workability. So you see this as a workable action. You see that this is a workable channel. So you don't even beat the drum and say individuality is everything, you know. You don't have to. But you are to some degree pushing this forward because it is a line of truth.

You want to make some group better. The optimum way to make some group better is – you can't stand back and process something called a group – you've got to get ahold of the members of the group, one after the other, and say, “Where's the wall?” Because the only people you're going to get to talk to in that group is the members of the group. Don't you see? You recognize that as truth, and therefore, it makes you a promoter of the individual.

Now, this, of course, will make you get in the road of governments. You see how this works out? You immediately will get in the road of governments, because they're selling the idea of THE – that's underscore – with Old English and Old American and Old German capital letters – THE government, see? The government must be all. The government must own everything, you see. And you're in the road of that, because you simply say, in your action, that you're going to process some individuals. Well, this is giving individuals attention, and probably a government can't take too much of that. And just the fact that you give some individuals attention will cause you to go against the governmental line.

Someday, somebody will swoop down and say that you're a wild-eyed revolutionary. And I just wanted to make these few remarks so that you'd understand wherein you are a revolutionary. You might not realize that treating the individual in a totalitarian world where the government must be all, is in actual fact almost a revolutionary action. Whether you intend to revolt or not – I don't even intend to revolt. It's beneath my dignity. But somebody'll say, well, you – they kind of feel that you might be in revolt, and so forth.

If you ever want to get along with a communist, I'll give you a little tip. You're scattered all over the world and someday you'll be talking to a communist. I hope that he won't have guns in his hands at the time you're talking to him and have overwhumped the particular society in which you exist, because that is the last dregs of individualism. All he can think of is self-criticism in his highest level of psychotherapy. Of course, he's trying to wipe

out the individual. And if you're ever talking to a communist, I can give you the perfect answer, the perfect answer to his communistic arguments – is just tell him you're an anarchist. You don't even have to know too much about what anarchy is. Just tell him you're an anarchist, see. And an anarchist isn't somebody who throws bombs, that was the way the capitalists handled them back around the turn of the century. He's simply a fellow who believes that no government should exist.

And you take the poor communist, and he's drilled up, one-two-three-four, his arguments are perfectly laid out, they're all wonderfully grooved, he's been taught them by rote; how to handle the capitalist; how to handle the social democrat; how to handle the royalist. You see, he's been taught all these things, and he's there giving you more or less the common denominator of those arguments, and he gets just about so far, and you look at him innocently and say, “What are you talking to me like that for? You probably don't realize that I'm an anarchist.”

And watch him shift his gears, you know. It's one of these ... He can't even make a racing shift out of it, you know. Gear teeth spitting out of the crankshaft, you know, and everything going to hell. And long ago, why, they realized that the anarchist was probably their greatest foe, and they had to cultivate him, and they have fantastic overts on anarchists all over the world, because, of course, their overt is against individualists, you see. And you will get one of the fanciest songs and dances, after he's wrecked the transmission, that you ever wanted to listen to, as to how government is really necessary.

See, he's been talking about tearing down the state, tearing up everything, trying to – you know, destroy it all and so forth – and then you say you're an anarchist – he has to shift gears, and tell you, “Now, look, some government is necessary.” You see? And you immediately make the poor guy become a conservative. And he has to shift from the wild-eyed revolutionary, of course, to the long-jawed conservative.

Of course, I never branded myself as an anarchist, but I have told anarchists that I thought they were far, far, far, too far to the right. And that was – kind of settled the argument – too conservative for me. Ha-ha! Of course you don't know where to go with that argument, you see, because there's nothing over there but a cliff!

But the funny part of it is the communist, because of this collision of term-oppterm, the first thing he's got to destroy is the individual. And anarchy has always been rampant in countries just before communism took over. And they're the one political breed of cat that the communist respects and fears. That is the one thing he fears. He will always try to get the anarchist's cooperation. He isn't likely to stand anarchists up in front of the firing squad, not of course until he's taken over completely, see. But if he feels any security – insecurity whatsoever in his push, he'll always butter up an anarchist, see; always very careful of anarchists, you see. Very, very careful.

Down in Spain, during the Spanish Revolution, and so forth, why, there were anarchists all over the place, you know. And the communists were pushing them on and patting them on the back, and of course they'd eventually get rid of all the anarchists, you know, out of public office and that sort of thing. But they never could quite come up to ... See, it's a matter of too many overts. The thing is almost becoming sacred to them.

But you watch these evolutions of government, it becomes very amusing. I didn't mean to give you a talk about it, but you have a world here which is tipping over this way, and tipping over that way, and it's kind of hard to understand some of these things. What are these fellows after? What are they doing, and so on. You find many communistic principles are safely ensconced now in US law, you know. The principles of taxation, principles of ownership of property and that sort of thing are going more and more and more into US law. And they're taken straight out of the textbook of Karl Marx.

Not me saying so – I said so one day and the *Wall Street Journal* picked it up, which is quite interesting – that the tax laws now used by the United States are taken directly from Karl Marx. This is all very, very fascinating, but it gives you the idea of terminal and oppterm, how these things then become combination terminals and mix up in general.

Makes it quite a fascinating picture. Because things won't get straighter in the political arena. You can forecast that they will become progressively more confused. And it'll always be that way.

In the absence of processing, in the absence of somebody straightening out people, in the absence of somebody informing people, they will just become more and more tangled up; more and more confused. Lord knows what political philosophy would emerge out of this, but you could predict it. You could take those political philosophies which are opposed to those political philosophies, take the common denominators of the two – probably the worst points of both – and it'll become the combination terminal which is tomorrow's politics. If you ever want to forecast it, just take a look at the GPM and apply it to mankind on the fourth dynamic, and you probably will have a fairly reliable answer.

It's rather awe-inspiring. Fortunately, it takes sometimes upwards to a hundred years for this wheel to turn, you see. Sometimes two or three hundred years for it to turn completely, but you can see what will eventually be in charge. I said that and you thought I meant a joke – actually it is the least desirable characteristics of both terminal and oppterm, and you will get the combination terminal that will become. A rather sorry look. But it's on the basis of that which is least admired tends to persist.

And if you can imagine the worst characteristics of the United States and the worst characteristics of Russia, see, combined, and the good characteristics vanished, why, you will get a superstate that will ride up the line someplace or another and is likely to materialize, unless somebody like us comes along and shows them da road. Say, “What you goin' down for

in that coal pit? Why don't you walk out here on the grass?" Unless somebody does that, that was – that's exactly what would occur.

The situation in handling cases – I've been talking about the fourth dynamic, that gives you a look – when you look at the third and fourth dynamics – at the eventual fate of any individual you process. This is in the argument to the refutation that people give you that you have to do a lot of livingness and if you did enough livingness you would eventually come out with some new, high, desirable state. Well, I'm sorry that that doesn't seem to hold good. To get the data you would clear somebody up so that he could carry on a bit further without it happening.

But supposing that without processing you could find a terminal and oppterm in the individual. Well, you know, you didn't relieve it in any way, you just located these things, you see, in some fashion. Not in any way that was therapeutic. If you located his chief terminal and his chief opposition terminal, and then you took the least desirable characteristics of both, you'll get the combination terminal that this person will become in a few generations.

That's a gloomy look, but it happens to be an accurate one. Now, a lot of you have had terms and oppters found. And of course, those that were found first were nearest to the top of the stack and therefore would be the ones which were most likely to produce the next pair. Well, they will actually produce a single unit, ordinarily, before they produce anything like new terminals and oppters. And if you take your first terminal and your first opposition terminal, and then figure out what's the worst characteristics of both of them, you have got a life of yours somewhere in the future mocked up that you're not going to have to live. I know that sounds like it's gloomy and pessimistic and so forth, but there it is. It's not. It's quite accurate.

And as your GPM flies off, if you sat still long enough to watch it go by and added it all up, you'd find out that this had been taking place rather consistently. The amount of horsepower and freedom which is there to be freed is fantastic. Because you never touch a case that isn't in a tremendously deteriorated state.

Now, when we made the first discoveries – I'm talking to you now about rock slammers and cases and oppters and so forth – of the tremendous power exerted over the individual of his basic postulate that created each section of the GPM, when we first ran into this, we had a tendency to recognize it as something brand-new. Something brand-new.

And I know it's in the first book – that is, *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health*. It talks about the individual and his basic purpose. It's quite a discussion of that in there. I hadn't – wasn't aware of the fact – Suzie was reading *Dianetics: The Original Thesis, 1947*. I wasn't aware of the fact that it went earlier than that. But it goes back here to the definition of the first dynamic as written in *The Original Thesis*, on page 14 of the Wichita printing of that. And apropos of nothing particular here we find, startling enough, all eight dynamics on page

14 and 15, and all completely defined, and so on. All properly numbered. This wasn't rewritten for publication – this was published back in 1951. And we get the definition of the first dynamic, is: “The dynamic of self, consists of the dynamic thrust to survive as an individual, to obtain pleasures as an individual and to avoid pain. It covers the general field of food, clothing and shelter, personal ambition and general individual purpose.”

I'd forgotten myself that it was woven into the woof and warp of the subject right from the start. Now, this general individual purpose is on top of any mass or general purpose of, you might call, the basic.. . Well, theta has, and follows, certain general laws. We find these in the Axioms.

A thetan does these various basic things. But he also splinters off and postulates some portion of them or some specialization of them. And he postulates this all off his own bat, and then tries to go forward with this as an individual purpose, aside from the basic Axioms. And he tries to go forward with this, moves onward, trying to affect it and builds up a tremendous amount of accumulated mass and all sorts of oddball items, you know: terminals, oppterm, combination terminals, upsets of various kinds or another. And he builds up a section that we call the GPM and then he will postulate something else, and then he builds up another section of the whole GPM, and then that finally dwindles out, and he somehow or another gets himself free of that – that's – I don't say he gets himself free of it, he sort of, you know, he gets out of it someday. Re gets blown up thoroughly enough that he forgets it utterly. Let me put it that way. And he makes up a new individual purpose and goes on from there.

Well, actually all these things are in controversion to the basic laws of this universe and theta and the purposes of thetans and so forth. And if there is any reason why it builds up mass, it is because it's an alter-is of the Axioms. Ever think of it that way? See? Fellow's being an individual, but he's being an individual with an exclamation point! He already is in some kind of a games condition with his fellows and the universe at large, and being in this state, why, he decides to be even more different. And he postulates what we're digging up as a goal. His basic purpose, his goal. And then this, of course, is counter to the behavior patterns and former agreements and construction of the universe as contained in the Axioms, and so he is individuated out from that to that degree that he now has pitted himself against the whole lot – the whole works. He's flown in the teeth of every agreement he has previously made, which I consider quite adventurous. But that's all right.

What we're finding out when we talk about clearing – we're finding out as we turn on somatics in the individual; as we find items in the person; we find terminals and oppterm; what we're finding out is, is he hasn't gotten away with it. Do you see that as an interesting sidelight on the situation?

There's the GPM and it's killing him, see. He's got a goal, he's got an individual purpose and he can't even execute it.

Find it very difficult even to execute his own individual purpose. Well, of course, to execute it, he's flying in the teeth of all the agreements. And then remember, he's part of these agreements, you see. He's part creator of these original agreements we call the Axioms. So he's called himself a liar to that degree and he is now departed out into the zones and areas of superindividuality and there we go.

Now, as the individual goes forward, postulating a new goal, he of course is flying in the teeth of and alter-ising all of his former agreements. So now he gets up to a point of where he explodes out of the bank or something of the sort and he says, "Well, the bank is over there and I'm here," and he now postulates, again, a new individuation. He postulates a new basic purpose for himself. And he lives that one on out and it accumulates mass and then he adds it to the first mass and somehow or another one day, why, he manages to get an unrestimulated environment, or get blown up or something of the sort, and he suddenly says, "Well, all right, I'm free of all that and that's all gone and that's all passed and so on." He manages to get quite free of it, in actual fact. And he postulates a *new* basic purpose for himself, you see, and then that's in the teeth of all of his own basic purposes and then that's all in the teeth of all of the basic purposes which he agreed on with everybody else to have anyhow. And you see, so it doesn't take too long for that one to get in a ball. That gets in a ball much more rapidly, actually. It's much easier for that one to create a GPM section.

So he's actually going on a shorter and shorter cycle track. The cycles of the track are becoming shorter and he's finding more and more things that he can't do, and more and more things that he can no longer confront, and one day he says, "How come it's all black?" – will be practically his sole comment on the thing. He won't explode out of this mass again, don't you see? This fortuitous circumstance which momentarily freed him from the GPM that he'd already racked up, well, he's just so dug in it just doesn't happen.

Now, the person who is sitting there saying, "Well, I don't really want to be Clear," is just being a ruddy idiot. He's almost beneath an auditor's contempt. If he had the data before him or he'd looked it over, any subjective reality on it at all, and then he said no, he doesn't want to be Clear, or he doesn't want to be free of this, or he doesn't want to be on the straight road again, or anything like this, the guy's an idiot! That's all.

Now, somebody who gets very angry at Scientology and won't be processed again and has got fantastic personalities getting in his road – how he just can't possibly be processed because the Central Organization's Org Sec Sec, or something like this, has blotted the stationery of the last letter that was written to him, don't you see – has caused this terrible ARC break. Wow! He ought to be glad there is an Org Sec Sec, even though he says – even though the Org Sec Sec says to him whenever he walks in the office, "You blankety-blank-blank." He ought to say – not necessarily take it, but certainly, that from somebody who is perfectly willing to help him on his road and out of his mess ... Look, he's got this stacked up against, not the next two hundred trillion years, really, he's got this stacked

up against an oblivion, an oblivion of total pain and sen.

You want to look and find out what hell is, what's this thing they're talking about? Usually in religions they'll have some metaphorical method of trying to communicate. And if they were ever talking about a hell – this is hell. See, this is hell. They recognize there's something waiting for them in the future. They try to shorten it up, you know, and say it's the next life and this time you die and you'll go to it. Well, that's just enthusiasm. But sooner or later the individual does reach that hell.

Now, it's very interesting for somebody to persuade people into believing that he can offer them heaven, and that there is a heaven. I imagine down through the Dark Ages, at one time or another, why, I imagine I must have gotten drunk and kicked off or kicked off while I was drunk, and maybe spent hours going around trying to find the Pearly Gates. I imagine that I've done this. I have no clear recollection of it. I have clear recollection of sneering, but not of doing much looking.

But it's often occurred to me: how about this Joe that has bought pie in the sky, you know. He just bought it by the slab, you know. And he kicks off, you know, and he backs up through the window with the whole GPM dragged after him, you know, and sticks to the walls and does various other things, and sits down and waits for the heavenly messenger or something, you know. Or for somebody to blow a couple of toots on an air horn. And supposing at that moment, why, somebody in a Jaguar came by and pushed the button on a horn. Why, he'd be sure, you see, that's Gabriel. Imagine the bird; he wanders around and caroms off the trees, and looks for Pearly Gates, and that sort of thing. That's why I've always been very careful to have *black* gates on houses and that sort of thing.

But the essence is this guy's been sold, see. He's been sold a bill. And he eventually says, "Well, I must've had my map wrong," or something. He comes back and picks up another body and then somebody starts talking to him about pie in the sky and they're going to save him and he's liable to go to hell. Well, he instinctively knows that he is going to go to hell. That much of it's true. If he lives long enough, he'll be in hell, don't worry about it. And so he'd just as soon have some heaven. And eventually he gets to the point where he can't be sold heaven. See, anytime you say, "You can be free," he gets it tangled up with the number of times he's been up knocking on somebody's wrought iron, thinking that was the Pearly Gates, you know, and nobody let him in, and no harps or halos being issued today, you know. I imagine they get into some awful confused areas, probably wind up over here at Hobbs Barracks, in front of the – in front of the Uniform Issue Department, or something like that. You can imagine. They get tangled, see.

Anyhow, you don't know what confusion they get into, but they get into this confusion: that they begin to regard the real thing as pie in the sky. So you say to somebody, "All right, well, I can straighten you out," and even though he's sitting in the chair he sometimes has a very wide reservation. He's been straightened out before!

Sometimes down in Spain they used to straighten them out with pine fagots. They fixed them up. If they confessed at the last moment, why, they let them die without putting ice on their chest as they burned them at the stake. I think that was what they gave them. And they said they would be saved and wouldn't necessarily go to hell. Yeah, the auto-da-fé, the way they used to slow down the person's death with wet cloths, and that sort of thing.

Rather gruesomely got restimulated out here the other night when we did a Guy Fawkes celebration for the kids. Little Arthur was complaining about it, he wanted to put the clothes on one of his dolls or his teddy bears and we insisted on burning them up, and he was rather provoked about the whole thing. He probably was being more smart about it than we were.

Anyhow, this fellow's been saved in innumerable, painful ways, which have wound him up a great many cul-de-sacs and blind alleys with his feet full of tacks. And so you walk up to somebody and you say you're going to clear him and save him and do something for him, you see. And you're liable to restimulate all this. It comes out in "reasons we can't clear you," you see. "What would be the consequences of our clearing you?" Actually, no matter what he says, it's sort of based on these failures.

Now, you get somebody who has really been made to fail on the whole track, with magnitude in exclamation points, and he's going to – he's going to fight it all the way. He's going to have a lot of trouble. He's going to sense all the time something is wrong. Right up to the time you give him a reality on the fact that something is happening.

The kindest way to handle such a person is to give him a fast reality on the fact that you mean business. Not by pulling a magic fire out of the top of a vase and giving him a bunch of overwhump, and that sort of thing. He's seen that before. But actually doing something for him subjectively that he can realize that he is on a road to truth.

People that this has happened to, to too great a degree have always got one eye sort of squinted, just a little bit, waiting for the payoff, see. There is liable to be a trick involved with this, and so on. And frankly it makes an auditor's life rather uncomfortable sometimes. The pc is sitting there and the pc has no trust. His trust level is just shot, you know. And therefore, he doesn't answer the auditing commands, he alter-ises them, he does this and that with them. He knows he'd better not put himself in your power, because too often when he has kicked off he's gone looking for those Pearly Gates and he hasn't found any.

But the trust level – the trust level on what we are doing, of course, generally is not very, very good. The healing sciences today are frankly almost beneath contempt. They aren't doing anything very much for anybody. They're pretty good plumbers. They can normally set a bone or do something like that. They're not bad at things. Sometimes they can do plastic surgery and so forth. These things are nice. Mechanically they're not bad.

But just go in to one of their offices sneezing, the most awful things are liable to

happen to you. You know, probes going up your nose and all this sort of thing. You know. You're wildly allergic to one of these wonder drugs, you know, and they shoot you full of it and you break out with the hives and ... It's marvelous, you know. They have very few specifics. Of course, they're handy to have around when they work, but it's no great general level. It's almost fantastic, the degree of clutch which this type of healing has on the environment, until you realize that the environment always accepts it as just sort of a fake anyway. They don't approach it with any trust anyway and so on. Well, it's the type of society you're going up against and this pc you're auditing is bred in that kind of a society. So it's no wonder he doesn't follow your auditing commands.

You see, he sort of pretends to. He's like the maiden with a large cold bath before her. And she doesn't even put her big toe in. See, she wants to get the temperature of the water by intuition. And it takes quite a little bit to build up against that. You get the most remarkable kickbacks. It is that single thing which is the hardest thing for an auditor to go up against – is just a very bad trust level.

Now, the mechanics of how it got that way are very valuable and very important to you, but don't overlook the fact that its importance, the importance is actually great in that your dissemination is stopped by practically nothing else. There's hardly anything else stands in the road of dissemination, except that, just that low trust level.

The people that scream that we're quacks and bums and rats and dogs and fakes and all that sort of thing are usually themselves operating in this. The only people that really get enthusiastic about it are yelling at you as an oppterminal situation, don't you see, in a very remarkable way. The psychologist, of course, must realize – must have realized long ago; the psychoanalyst must have realized long ago, that they had little or no freedom for man and quite often deteriorated his condition beyond all recognition. They must have realized this a long time ago and yet they're the first to call us fakes, you see. The birds with the dirtiest hands are throwing the most mud. And it's always a good way to identify the situation. That is a general factor.

Now, this individual has already fought the physical universe, and the basic laws of the physical universe – after agreeing to them – he now alter-ises them and, of course, those laws concern matter, energy, space and time, so he starts accumulating matter, energy, space and time, and that's what puts it in his bank, you see. Then he makes an individual purpose, which has nothing to do with these other purposes, don't you see? And he tries to go up against them with this individual purpose, and this, of course, accumulates more mass than you can count. And now he's going to think up another individual purpose and that goes against his first individual purpose and all the purposes behind him. And now he's got a third goal that he postulates up there. Oh, this gets very, very interesting.

But all that's true, but it must have been based originally on a very low level of confidence and trust anyway. He must have had a very, very low level of confidence to have

gone to all this trouble. See, he couldn't possibly have trusted what was going on. He must have thought that it was detrimental, or he wouldn't have taken all this trouble to have individuated from it.

You find most pcs are mad at the physical universe, to some degree or another; they'll find some complaints against the physical universe. Well, let me tell you, the physical universe is going to stay here for that individual, until that individual ... Now, here's something I've never told you before, but it follows sequitur. It's actually understood in the sixty-four Philadelphia lectures of 1952. I've never mentioned it in connection with modern clearing.

And that is this: That after you get goal number one ... Now, you see, we're numbering goals backwards, just for the sake of nomenclature. We don't know how many goals the fellow has postulated for himself, so we can't call this the first goal we pick up – as “number thirty-four,” don't you see, or something like that, because we don't know what number it is. So we're calling that the first goal. I'm talking about the first goal he postulated after the Axioms. And after we get back to that – what was, for him, the original individuating goal – you think you're going to have a total OT. Well, actually you're not, you know. You've got the Axioms.

Now, you're going to back up, up the Axioms. Recognize that? Now, sooner or later, this pc's going to start talking to you about the Axioms. You could carefully have hidden from a pc all lists and conversation concerning an – Axioms, and then clear him on up the line, he'll sooner or later start telling you the Axioms. Well, at this time they're getting ready to blow. But his agreement to those Axioms, his contribution to that degree, is of course, you know, the greatest probability, his first basic trap. You may have to get back to them and run them. See, they may not blow at all. Sooner or later he'll collide with them going backwards. And those are all individuating purposes from the basic purpose.

It's a funny thing, but you have to go a long way back to pick up more than the first dynamic. You start picking up more than the first dynamic w-a-a-a-y back on the track, see. A fellow's usually on an – even on today – he's on an inversion of the first. And you'll find out there are about seven dynamics going to invert on you, you know, reverse the inversion process, before he gets to a straight first dynamic. And then when he gets to a straight first dynamic, he's got to go quite a ways before he gets sight of the other dynamics. There's what you're tackling. There's what you're running up against in the bank.

We're the only people who can go up against opposition terminals or masses or something like that and get away with it. Only a Scientologist is safe in his attacks. See that? A hell of a thing, but it actually gives you an unlimited license for overts. You can always run them out. Nobody else can. Interesting, isn't it?

But here is a basic thing that lies in every pc, whether this pc is a rock slammer or otherwise, it's a deteriorated trust. Not only a trust in his fellow man has deteriorated, but also

his trust in organizations, in group activities, in any effort whatsoever to do anything for him – he has to some degree or another deteriorated at his level of trust. And he's sort of nervy about it. He gets very nervous when you start going in that direction, because he knows that's always been dangerous to him. And you're reversing his experiential track, so he's going back into areas that he thinks are dangerous. And thinking these areas are dangerous, he's sort of nervous.

Now, this applies to every pc you process. It's just your skill as an auditor and the smoothness of your Model Session and the positiveness of what YOU are doing and the fact that you can produce a result in the pc on which he has a reality. And he realizes you are going in the direction of freedom. Now the funny part of it is he may be sufficiently low downscale that the fact he is going in the direction of freedom, it looks so good that he can't have it. And you get into another *rickle-rackle*, you know. He won't let himself have it now, because it's too good, you know. That's unobtainable and you know he – so on ... It's like you pushed a three-story cake at a little kid and said, "It's all yours," you know. And hell stand and look at that thing for hours! He won't touch it. Can't believe it, you know. Probably made out of cardboard and paint. Very suspicious.

Now, if you add to this, this other idea, that if you existed and if you freed man and if you did things for the physical universe, then this person couldn't execute the first and foremost goal or individual purpose that you're going to run into in processing him, see, the first one you're going to pick up on him, that he couldn't have this and he couldn't do it if you or freedom or anything else existed – you got a rock slammer.

But I just want to make it clear to you, that when you look at a person who is fighting the auditor or Scientology or the organization or having a hell of a time and can't tell why, and it's – he's just getting all messed up about this thing, and you look at this person; recognize that that distrust is not just built on this individual goal that you're going to run into as goal one. No, that's not built on that. That is built on a quicksand of distrust that goes earlier than that. Of course he's got goal after goal that goes before that, and he's got stuff, stuff, stuff, stuff, stuff. So his level of trust, of course, is very poor to begin with. Then you pop up and you say, "Well, yeah, I'm going to clear you, I'm going to clear men, I'm going to do things for people," and this is all contrary to his basic purpose that you're going for; is the first goal you're going to find – you got a rock slammer. That rock slammer is already built on quicksand that everybody's made out of

As soon as your auditing deteriorates and becomes less than perfect, as soon as you start fumbling and mucking it up and failing to deliver some reality of some kind or another to a pc, you rekindle, or permit to remain – if it's already going at full blast, which it usually is – all of this morass of distrust that has been generated by all the pie in the sky the fellow has ever been promised. A man's reality on hell and his certainty on hell is far, far better than his reality on heaven, because heaven has never existed and hell has.

And all you got to do on this track is flub a little bit. Actually, you have quite a broad margin of the amount of flub you can flub. You don't have to be absolutely down the line, you're not whipping at it on a total perfection, you see. But you let this case drift too far without a good positive result – you let this fellow go hours and hours and hours of sessioning without any kind of a win – you're not keying in just his basic purpose, you're keying in the whole background of “there is no heaven.” And you pay the penalty.

And the longer you take to produce a result on a pc, the more difficult it is to produce that result, Just because of this distrust factor which I've been discussing with you.

Now, I don't know whether rock slammers deserve it or not, and I probably ought to keep this to myself and never give you the solution to the rock slammer. We're being very hard on rock slammers, and we should recognize ... Actually a lot of people who are simply nattering after they've been processed for a while, will turn out to be rock slammers. You know, there are a lot of people around who are below being rock slammers.

Your intuition for an individual, that this guy is not all right and he doesn't mean all right, is actually more reliable than your E-Meter where it comes to this, because you may have to process him for some hours before you find out he's a rock slammer. You recognize that's not a vital test, see. That's not totally valid as a test. It's rather conclusive when it does occur. But that it doesn't occur absolves nobody. See, it's sort of like the heaven-hell situation. You see, hell exists, but heaven probably doesn't.

Similarly, people probably aren't, until they're proven to be. But you couldn't say that nobody is. You can't say positively that this person isn't. You get the notion there? Because there's no absolute test of absolvance, except the person's ability to measure up and your feeling about the person, their progress in processing, when you add these things up, why, you say to yourself, “Well, this guy can't possibly be a rock slammer.”

Well, what about this? What about this rock slammer? What about this manifestation? Well, all it is, is his degree of overt in your direction and his weird belief that if you or whatever he's rock slamming about exists, then he will never be able to achieve his basic, individual purpose. He believes this, so he fights you. Realize that the first moment you find it out and he finds it out has a tendency to pull its teeth. You never really see a rock slammer going full blast after you found out he was a rock slammer and he knows it too. Quite interesting. Just the fact of discovering the fact and he discovers it the same time that you do. He didn't know it before. Sometimes he won't believe you, but he's got a pretty good idea.

Now, I don't know whether a rock slammer deserves it or not, for me to give you this other tip. If they cause anybody any trouble, of course you can always forget this. But it's just this: all you have to do is opposition what they're slamming on. Say they're slamming on “an auditor,” you know, just the whole subject of “an auditor,” all you've got to do is write your opposition list to “an auditor” and you'll – you've – just all you've run into is your

first package in present time. And it tends to blow up in smoke. Frankly, an auditor capable and able, with 3GA Criss Cross, would not really require any time at all to straighten out a rock slammer. I don't know, two, three hours, at the outside. You see, you've got the list and find the item. And actually, the case folds up as a rock slamming case, as such.

But, of course, this person can have goals listed against any terminal, you can list a goal against any terminal that rock slams, and you can list a goal against any oppterm that rock slams, see. You can list a goal against an item that rock slams. If it's an oppterm, you say, "What goal of yours would be impossible to achieve if this thing existed?" you know, or something like that. Lists headings already exist for that. You can use that terminal directly. Sometimes you just get the guy's goal laid on the line.

But even if you've got the guy's goal laid on the line – this was the only other point I was making – even if you've got this person's goal laid on the line, opposition it. Get your opposition to whatever he was slamming on. Now, you can always – let's say you have some person in an organization or in your group and this person's been causing quite a bit of trouble and you take him and give him a rock slam test and you find – don't find a rock slam, you only find a dirty needle on Scientology. You tiger drill it for a moment and it doesn't clean up. That thing's going to develop into a rock slam someday. All you've got to do, actually, is opposition it. The person's whole viewpoint on the subject of Scientology will shift. This is a very easy one to handle, in other words. You shouldn't worry about it too much. It means more than it appears to mean. And probably you would neglect it, ordinarily, that elementary step. You would use the rock slam to find the person's goal and you would go on. You shouldn't do that, because the person will give you a lot of trouble. Not as much as they were before, but if you opposition it, the trouble will evaporate. You see?

So the whole case, anyway, is built on quicksand of distrust, and when it comes up to the fact that we are the oppterm and we're the cowboys in the black hat and he's the cowboy in the white hat – the way he looks at it – and to us we're the cowboys in the white hat and he's the cowboy in the black hat, you recognize that you can blow this whole thing up rather easily. You realize the rock slammer most consistently goes out and becomes a squirrel, says he practices Scientology while doing psychiatry or something, see. He gets – he makes himself into a combination terminal, promptly, because he realizes instinctively that he's crazy as a loon to be attacking us.

But you can solve this, and it's pretty easy to do. I hope there's some data in what I have told you that gives you some assistance in handling cases.

Thank you.