

ASSESSMENT

A lecture give on
12 May 1961

Thank you.

Looks like an ACC. This is May the 12th, 1961.

Somebody hand me an E-Meter, would you? That's all right.

Now, I don't want you to get the idea that this course consists basically of formal lectures. Of course, in most ACCs, I back up the Instructors and I give them all the information I can, but I actually seldom go over individual cases. In this particular course I'm going over individual cases with a finetoothed Ron. I see your auditor's reports every day and try to keep it on the wheels.

But what can happen here is that you go around in a fog of some kind or another and you got some kind of a burning question or a big withhold or a dissatisfaction or something like that, and I don't hear about it. All right, if that takes place, why, the obvious thing to do is to write me a despatch or grab ahold of me when you see me . . . I try to get down here every afternoon. A despatch will get to me very easily. It has hardly any distance to go at all because you're in the middle of HCO's worldwide communications, and we really keep them whirring around here. We don't know how well they do in London, but here we do fine. All right. Matter of fact they're doing all right in London now.

Now, I've got to talk to you about assessment, and that's what this is all about: assessment. Boy, I tell you, there seems to be an awful lot to know about assessment that I considered was a lead-pipe cinch.

Don't get the idea that what you're doing is experimental. It is not experimental. But I'll tell you that trying to find out what you do wrong with it and how to communicate how to do it right is a complex drill all of itself. And if there's anything that's being worked with, it is that. But that is always worked with. That always has to be worked with. How do that isn't what we're teaching. And the data that we're teaching goes straight into the middle of a reactive computation.

SOP Goals, right here at this minute, is doing this exact thing and nothing else: It is exactly reversing how the mind got aberrated and it reverses that exact process. Now, I'm not trying to hand out any stink cabbages to myself about this having been a hot piece of mental prestidigitation to get this job done. The best evidence of that is the fact that it had not been done before.

All I'm trying to do here is show you that the most hidden factors of the mind were, of course, the things that aberrated the mind, because nobody has ever freed a mind before. So therefore, they must have been the most concealed or they would have gotten as-is-ed. Just as simple as that, see? Almost anybody could have come along and as-is-ed them if they hadn't been very hidden.

So although SOP Goals, at first glance, looks very simple, it is actually undoing all of the factors which made a mind plow in, made a person's ability run downhill, and it consists of all the solutions that a person adopted to fix up oddball circumstances that haven't anything to do with anything anymore ever, and probably had nothing to do with it then.

Here is this little fellow, he's playing out here on the hill, and he's just having a marvelous time. And he goes around and listens to panpipes and dances with the goats. And he's free as the breeze, and everything is wonderful. And the next thing that we hear of him, he's a general of armies, and he's miserable, and he's upset, and he's eventually assassinated. What happened?

Who wouldn't want to have the kind of mind that could be happy doing something simple? Who wouldn't want to have this kind of a mind? Well, I don't know anybody who wouldn't want to have it, in the long run, because basically what you're afraid of is getting bored. Well, how come you get bored?

It must be what you're doing is somehow or another insufficient or inadequate to the demands of the environment.

Well, this little boy dancing on the hill amongst the goats . . boy, he must have been invalidated within an inch of his life. It must have been proven to him conclusively that the game of playing with goats was no game to be played, and he's lost a very simple game in the favor of a very complicated game which he never did enjoy. What happened to him?

Well, something had to happen to him. First, he himself had to get somebody involved in that kind of a situation on the backtrack. He himself had to take a little boy playing and dancing with the goats and push him into a position where he assumed enormous responsibility for him to have the Achilles' heel, eventually, of falling for the same trap. Well, you'd certainly never look for that because we're totally educated to believe that everybody became a victim.

Now, I'll show you how far we've gone: Dick was commenting the other day on the old tapes of the Philadelphia lectures. And he says, "You're talking about . . there's comments in there about being trapped in the MEST universe, and so forth. Well, we all kind of thought that at that time, and it was sort of obvious," and so forth. Well, you couldn't have been trapped in the physical universe unless you trapped somebody in it. Well, who would have looked for this oddball factor?

The psychologist knew the stimulus-response. He knew that if you kicked Bill, Bill was kicked. That was a stimuli of some kind or another. But if the kick was a stimuli, then Bill was restimulated into doing something. But he didn't say what.

He totally didn't look at the other end of the line at all. What was the consequences of kicking Bill? It isn't a stimulus-response factor at all; it's an overt-motivator sequence. To get kicked in the butt it is necessary to kick somebody in the butt. You get the idea? I mean, it's this idiot simplicity. You had to open yourself up on this postulate: "Being kicked in the butt is bad. And people don't want to be kicked. I am a people, therefore I don't want to be kicked in the butt, therefore I must resist being kicked in the butt, therefore I am certainly going to be kicked in the butt." And there's your overt-motivator sequence at work in the most inelegant, stupid form.

Who would have looked for these factors? Well, over a course of about eleven years, we've got them rounded up. The proof of the pudding, now, is the fact that we can go ahead and do things with cases that have never been done before, with an accuracy . . or if it is done with an accuracy. We can do it with an accuracy if it is done with an accuracy. In other words, we can advance a case accurately . . almost as if we set it up and say "It'll be here. It'll be there. It'll be there. And this'll happen, and this'll happen, and this'll happen" as a total predict . . as long as everything done with the case is done with complete accuracy.

Now, we know all the things that have to be done with a case. Now, there are only two reasons why people don't clear. I'll expand that, because you are studying these other things . . there's three reasons why people don't clear.

Inadequate knowledge of technical application: That would be your first largest heading. Person doesn't know the TRs, doesn't know how to read an E-Meter, doesn't know Model Session, and doesn't stay inside the Auditor's Code, you see? Now, actually I'm not giving you "There are a whole large number of these things to know. There are literally thousands . . ." No, that's not so, see? I stated them all when I just made that statement. Technical application just includes those things.

Next is the accuracy of assessment: The assessment must be done with total accuracy. There is not such a thing as a slightly correct assessment. In spite of the Dianetic Axiom that absolutes are unobtainable, there is such a thing as a perfect assessment. It is an absolute . . a perfect assessment.

Now, it is very strange and very peculiar that there could be such a thing as a perfect assessment, because there isn't any such thing as a perfect mind. Here's an artificial perfection which you are trying to attain on a case. And it is highly artificial . . extremely so. And it has to be done exactly right. And we're learning more and more how to do it exactly right by finding out the things you're doing wrong.

That's a good way to learn though, isn't it? Don't make blunders, though, to teach other people. We don't need those; we got enough blunders at the present time. I have no insufficiency of havingness of blunders.

All right. What do people have to know? Well, evidently you have to invent certain things....

And just to conclude this three: The third one is an incomplete Prehav Scale. You don't have the full Prehav Scale at this moment, and there could be the possibility that cases could hang up for a missing link in the Prehav Scale. But that is not very serious, because if you have a perfect assessment and the case hung up in clearing when you did get the big, full-dress Prehav Scale, all that would be necessary to do is level those levels on the Prehav Scale that have not been flattened, because they weren't there, and the case will blow through to Clear. I mean, it's as easy as that. All you've done is put a little bit of a wait on the line. Well, man has been waiting, on this planet alone, for several thousand years, so I think we can stand a few days.

I got two stenographers typing themselves ragged right now trying to get that scale for you, just as though man hasn't been waiting for it for that long

Well, how do you do a right assessment? If that is the most single important thing to do. how do you do it? Well, apparently there's at the present time as many ways to do an assessment, almost, as there are people - apparently. There are lots of ways to do assessments.

Well, the more I look at it, the more it narrows down to the solemn fact that there's only one way to do an assessment to achieve a perfect assessment. I haven't really found any question about it. It isn't "Well, you could do this or you could do that." That isn't the case. Every time you look over two things you could do with an assessment, one inevitably emerges as infinitely superior to the other. It sorts itself out. We might not know, at this instant, everything there is to know that we have to tell you so that you will never make a mistake on an assessment. See, you might still be able to invent one. See, there might be something there that never quite gets through. I'm not being sarcastic; there's a distinct possibility this is the case. Therefore, we have to take every precaution that this doesn't happen.

Now, the first thing, then, you must know is that in SOP Goals there is no such thing as a nearly correct assessment. There is only one correct assessment. It is an absolute. Now, we said absolutes were unobtainable, but remember, we're only attaining an absolute upon an aberration. And that's very easy to do.

There is one assessment for one case and that is it. Now, what's odd is, in the first few days of running of a case - I'd say in the first few hours of run; anything up to thirty, forty hours of run - do you know that you can reassess at any time and get the same assessment? You know that you can always reassess. The auditing of an incorrect assessment does not wipe out the correct assessment. That's another lead-pipe fact. You can just wrap around that and hug it to your bosom because it's a very fortunate fact for you. It is extremely fortunate.

It means that you can make a mistake with a case and audit it for some little time - 25, 30, 40, 50, 60, 180 hours, and still do a right assessment on the case afterwards. Isn't that fascinating?

Of course, you're going to have trouble with the case the whole distance. He's going to be ARC breaky and blow-out-the-windowy, and he's going to be this and he's going to be that. And he may be upset or not progressing. The whole Prehav Scale may be getting kind of live and hotted up, and we can't quite figure out why the whole scale is getting hotter and hotter. It's just incorrect assessment.

So there might be difficulties in trying to hold somebody still and audit them on an improper assessment that only technical skill could overcome. And it isn't true that an absolutely perfect assessment always audits with perfect ease. See, that has its bumps too, because you may make a technical blunder, or something of this sort, as you run, that you'll have to patch up like mad, and the case is pretty trembly.

Now, let's take a good look at this. If you can always do a right assessment, even if a wrong one has been done, then the answer to vast difficulties which you're having with a case (or auditing a case for

30, 40, 50 hours without marked and distinct improvement) has as its answer . . . Those are the difficulties: auditing a case, and the case is just having one awful, horrible time, and you just practically can't hold the case in session, and the case is all ARC broke, and all of this stuff is going on. Answer? Reassess, perfectly.

All right. A wrong assessment: It was one of these almost-right assessments. If you'd just asked one more question or just two more goals it would have been right. But you missed that. No criticism here of having missed it. Only, if you get out of here and start missing assessments and I start hearing about it back over the lines again, I'll write the postmaster and have him turn in your thetan.

But if you did an almost-correct assessment and the case apparently ran but just seemed to go on running . . . That would be the symptom: The case just seems to go on running forever and seems about to put in the next 280 hours going the same way. No marked change is occurring for every given 12.5 to 15, 20 hours of auditing, see? No marked change on SOP Goals. Answer: Reassess.

Difficulties with SOP Goals would come about through your inability to apply things right technically. Let's say your TRs are all out. And you sit there, and you look at your E-Meter, and it's all sort of cross-eyed. And this thing keeps falling madly. The E-Meter keeps falling, and it keeps falling. And you say, "Peanuts?" You see? It's . . . you say, "Peanuts?" And there it goes. You say "Peanuts?" There it goes. And you say, "Well, peanuts are sure null."

You can make a technical blunder of this character, you see, and get all wound up in a ball if your confront is bad. Your pc may ARC break consistently and continually through just horribly bad technology, I mean a terribly poor administration of the TRs, Model Session and E-Metering. You're missing the living daylight out of the rudiments. You know, the man drops off the pin on a PT problem, and you say, "Well, that's flat." "Do you have a PT problem?" bang! "Well, that's flat. I'm glad we haven't got to handle a PT problem today." And then your pc starts blowing out of session and getting snarly, and so forth. Oh, you can make those blunders.

But the symptom of an imperfect assessment is you, with nearly perfect handling of Model Session, TRs and E-Meter, have one hell of a time keeping him in-session and he's always ARC broke with you. That's the result of an imperfect assessment. It's not a correct assessment, that's all. The thing to do is reassess.

Now, let's answer this question: Do we care how much time you spend doing an assessment? No. We do not care. There are ways to do assessments more rapidly, but there is no such thing as doing an assessment more accurately. You can be very sloppy doing an assessment. You can be quite rapid. You can be quite positive and very easy and very sure of yourself and come out with the exact answer at the other end. Or you can go at it slowly and ploddingly and chopping it all up and chewing everything up and spitting it all out and grinding, and so forth. If your Model Session's any good, you can keep the pc in-session, no matter how grim he thinks this is. But I don't care if you took 25 to 50 hours doing an assessment; I would much rather you did a perfect assessment than a fast, imperfect one.

For instance, I wouldn't care in an HGC if they took a whole intensive of 25 hours just to do one assessment. I wouldn't care. Or if this situation took place, I would consider this perfectly all right: A fellow does an assessment; it takes him 8 or 9 hours, or 10 or 12 hours, or something like this. And he did an assessment on this pc; he runs the pc for 5 or 6 hours and there's no change and there's no gain on the pc. I wouldn't take it amiss at all if he just scrapped that original assessment and neither should even a paying pc . . . scrapped that original assessment and did another assessment from scratch.

Doing assessment saves time, because the accuracy of the assessment, if perfect, prevents an infinity of auditing hours without clearing. So you have . . . well look, you'd have a thousand hours of an assessment would at least be a finite number of hours of processing. And if an assessment took a thousand hours to do a perfect assessment . . . that's utterly ridiculous, but if it did, it would still be better than doing a sloppy, fast one. A thousand-hour assessment would probably clear the fellow in a hundred or two, you see? So you'd have the totality of time in auditing: a finite period of twelve hundred hours.

But an imperfect assessment would give you an infinity of auditing hours, and that would be that. And this is the arithmetic that has to do with an assessment. He just never would get Clear. So there's no finite auditing period to an imperfect assessment. It will go on forever. And that is that! And it'll be very rough auditing too. And it'll just go on forever. Now, there is the advantage, then, of a perfect assessment.

How long should an assessment take? Well, when you're learning how, it's going to take a lot longer than when you don't have so many doubts and questions in your mind, naturally. I wouldn't even criticize you for a moment if it took you 15 hours to assess somebody. I wouldn't criticize you. It wouldn't even occur to me to criticize you.

But if you took 25 hours to assess somebody and then got the improper assessment, and it was way off the gun and off the beam, and then you say, "Well, I want to get on with auditing him so. . ." I would not be critical; I would again write the postmaster, and I would say "Please deliver one . . ."

There's your situation. Do you see the order of magnitude and how this thing sets up? Do you see how this is? Hm? Well please, if you don't learn anything else, learn that, because it's your foremost datum - the foremost datum which you have, and which I know now is absolutely true. This is one of those weird, big truths. It's only true as far as auditing is concerned; it's only true as far as clearing is concerned; but, within that framework, it is one gargantuan truth!

A perfect assessment is the only assessment that you can afford to do on the pc, regardless of time, effort, difficulty, money or anything else. It's the one that you can afford to do. It is the only one he can afford. If you were charging five hundred pounds for an intensive, and it took you 3 intensives to assess the pc, and it cost him fifteen hundred pounds to get a perfect assessment, do you realize that would be cheap? Hm? But that . . . regardless of what you got for an intensive, if he charged you a hundred pounds for 25 hours and did the assessment in 3 hours and did a wrong one, he's a thief. That is a complete waste of money. An imperfect assessment would be a complete waste of money. That's all there is to it.

Any auditing done now on SOP Goals . . . not preparing a case, not getting a fellow over his mother-in-law trouble, or any of the old-type of auditing that we have done; we're now talking about clearing people directly and overtly . . . any effort put onto clearing somebody, from the level of first-assessment, SOP Goals on, that does not result in a perfect assessment is wasted, and will continue to be wasted from there on out. The answer is assess perfectly, assess 100 percent.

Now, is there a way to assess? Is there an actual routine which is so precise that somebody could sit and look at you for 10 minutes and tell whether or not you were doing a correct assessment or not? Yes, such a system exists. It's not down on paper. There's a high probability that it can be stated on paper, that it actually could be followed stated on paper. But that gives you a high probability that it'll probably never be followed. Because we're dealing with the basic stuff of which the reactive mind is composed. And that on this subject more than any other subject, you are going to find more confusion, more silly questions . . . well, don't get mad at them. You realize that you're trying to lay into somebody a datum which restimulates the whole confounded reactive bank, boom! Just like that. I mean, you know, it's . . . you're right there in the middle of it.

Now, he went down the track this way. I will tell you now how to do one. The pc went down the track. So he was out there one day walking down a road, and he saw a little boy playing with the goats, and the little boy appeared to be very happy. And he was very grumpy that day, or just for the hell of it, he zapped the little boy. And he went on for a few centuries, and one day he was out there playing on the hill with the goats, and the king's men came along and wiped out all the goats and beat him and threw him amongst the dead. And he came to himself and decided that the thing to do was to rule king's men. Or maybe he decided the thing to do was to be a very rich merchant so that you could buy all the goats and the soldiers could just slaughter the goats ad nauseam and you still wouldn't run out of goats.

But you've altered his beingness because he has had to solve a problem, and the basic solution to the problem was a new beingness which gave him a new game. And a game consisted of beingness, doingness and havingness. Those are the components of the game. But he is now not being himself; he is being a solution to the problem of living.

And then one day (he became a merchant, let us say) pirates jumped upon all his cargoes as they were on the high seas and wiped him out, and pauperized him utterly and completely so that he went around whining, starving; children were sold into slavery, or anything else happened to him. And he decides then that he knows how to be a merchant: The way you should be a merchant is to be a naval captain.

Now, what an oddball situation this is! You have a fellow who wanted to be a merchant who actually is being a naval captain. Well, actually, most military lines, or naval lines, get into it in more or less this groove. And you'll find them then getting very close to commercial lines, but then they began to despise and have enormous contempt for commercial lines, and they won't have anything at all to do with commercial lines, don't you see?

So what do we see? We see a fellow who is now in a tertiary condition with regard to his game, which was playing with goats on a hill. There he is stomping up and down his quarterdeck saying "Flog 'em!"

And then one day, he is overcome by storms, battles, winds, everything else after long periods of time with this beingness and this game, and he decides the thing to be is a weatherman so that you can foretell storms. Now what game is he in? Now you're in the fourth position.

Now, it just literally took thousands of years don't think this happens fast it took thousands of years for him to make these shifts.

What beingness is real to this pc? What does he now consider a game? What does he think he has to do to have a good, safe, secure game? Well, as the result of all these beingnesses, it's the game somebody will permit him to play. Therefore, when you clear him without clearing up his beingness-havingness-doingness games condition - "be-do-have," "games condition": these things are synonyms - all right, you clear him up but you don't clear up any of these problems of the games condition. No, he's going to maybe go Clear, and then he's going to realize he has no game because he knows what he has to do in order to have a game: he's got to be able to foretell weather. And although you've got him very clear on the subject of foretelling weather, he actually kind of moved out of foretelling weather, and he knows you have to be pretty aberrated and worried to really be interested in foretelling weather, and he knows it's dangerous not to be able to foretell weather and not to foretell it. So he starts putting the thumbscrews on himself; which is to say, a naval captain gets overwhelmed by storms, see, so he brings up this engram and forces himself again to tell weather. And even though you got him up to Clear read, he will now be bored or upset. But he's really not bored, he's worried. He's got to get back there and foretell weather, and the thing to do to foretell weather is put the thumbscrews on himself of realizing what would happen to a naval captain. See? It's very simple. And he goes un-Clear. He just dives overboard, just like that, boom.

And again, he comes in, he's reading stickily on the meter. Well, what has he done? To state it very simply because it can be stated mechanically, too he knew that the only game that you could play would be that game of foretelling weather, and he knows you have to be aberrated to do it.

So it's less dangerous, he thinks the jerk to be aberrated than to fail to play the game of foretelling weather. That's what it amounts to. It's less dangerous to be aberrated, to have no friends, to get every kind of a of a domestic or business scene messed up anything that you could think of, see that is less dangerous than not to be in the game of foretelling weather. That's the way his thinkingness goes. So he goes un-Clear.

So therefore, you could use just plain processes on and on and on and on, and you'd eventually get this fellow up so he's reading on a free needle. And then he stays Clear for a little while and then he walks out, and then he's all of a sudden clank reading something else. And you say, "This is the most mysterious thing I ever saw in my life."

And we explained it one time by saying you could postulate himself . . . now he could postulate, and he can postulate himself un-Clear. And that was perfectly true and is exactly how he does it. But why? Why did he do it? Well, that's the games condition.

Unless you have cleared up his games conditions clear across the boards, he will continue to restore himself into an aberrated condition.

Now, here's the funny thing: He really can't foretell weather that's always the hooker on this . . . because he's too aberrated to foretell weather. See, he's got to play the game, and so you have nearly every human being on Earth today is in this condition of he's got to be something, but he can't be it. There's something wrong with being what he's being, and so he can't be it and so he really dare not be it and yet he must be it. And this emerges whenever you're auditing somebody on SOP Goals.

Very shortly along the line someplace he will tell you, "Oooohhh," he will say, "If I go on with just a few more commands of this, the situation which I found myself in, in life so far will become intolerable because now this goal I have is about to be cleared away, and I won't be able to do this anymore." And he comes to these fabulous conclusions which all the whole . . . (quote) ha! "science" of psychology came to in the States . . . psychoanalysis came to the conclusion; psychiatry, in general, came to the conclusion long ago . . . that artists only "art" because they're crazy, that people only do the things they do because they're crazy. Well, that is not at all true. That is not at all true.

People who are in a very good state of beingness, given the educational data, are not going to not do it anymore. They will actually be able to do it and have some fun, and do it well.

I'll give you an idea. I had . . . used to have grave qualms about docking ships. I can handle practically anything in the way of ships, but I started getting them around docks or around shallow ground . . . It's quite visible what this is: A ship isn't supposed to touch anything; it is not supposed to run aground, you know? It's not supposed to ram things. It's not supposed to go into cliffs, you see? So most of the time you're skipping a ship, you're preventing it from running into things. In other words, you're preventing a ship from communicating. That's about all it amounts to, you see?

And I thought, "Well, this is a very necessary thing, obviously." And I was thinking about ships and monkeying around with yachts, and so forth, and I was thinking about ships. I got a little . . . a few cognitions on this thing. It became very obvious to me, and I started to laugh at myself, you see, because "Well, you have to be very worried about ships in order to run ships." And I'd actually stopped running ships because I was worried about them . . . because I liked ships, because I wanted to run ships. You get the idea?

And this little thought came to me as I was sort of thinking this through and getting it straightened out . . . this little thought occurred to me: "Well now, if I became totally unworried about ships I would become totally incapable about them." Puh! What balderdash! The very fact you're worried about them will eventually cause you to ram docks with them. So therefore, you've got to withhold yourself from ships because you know you're going to damage them. So therefore, you've got to run ships because you can't run ships. See? So here's a whole zone of now-I'm-supposed-to's which wouldn't work out at all. Got the idea?

Well, I got this cleaned up and all of a sudden I realized that, oh, I don't know, I can dock ships and handle ships and do things with ships and run ships and navigate ships. And all of a sudden it looked very weird to me: "Why have I been worrying about ships?" And I'm getting one. Of course, it's an old hooker, but it's all right, see? That doesn't matter either. So the bottom falls out of it, so you take to the lifeboats.

Now, here's the essence of all these beingnesses and now-I'm-supposedto's (which is doingness) in order to have something: They get into a can't have . . . must-have, jammed-up situation, and a fellow has to abandon them because they've been invalidated too many times, and he's gotten invalidated in too many ways.

And there's this whole parade of these things: Here's a game, the fellow is fairly happy with the game, and something invalidated it. So he now goes into this new valence and plays this new game in order to keep the old game, which now he can't have. And now he's got this new game and he's got all the beingness, doingness and havingness of this new game, but something invalidates that. So he takes over on the winning valence of a new game, and he goes into this new game and the beingness, doingness

and havingness of this new game and then . . so forth. And he's becoming unhappy in life by this time, you see? But that invalidates the old game. Now something comes along and invalidates this new game and now he's . . for some reason or other, he isn't himself anymore. You see, he's just departed from it. His communication with the world has become very poor.

Now, in assessment, you're backtracking that exact "put on the new valence with the new doingness and havingness," you see . . "put on the new valence with the doingness and havingness." Only, people express these things as goals. That's what . . they express them. And you've got to have a game that is real to the pc. And what falls or reacts on the meter is what is real to the pc. So that is the first game you audit. And there's only one of them that is attainable or reachable.

Now, that's the oddity. If there's anything peculiar about this, that's the oddity. How come there's only one? Because obviously there are thousands of these things lying behind him. Well, there's only one at a time . . one at a time. And as these valences go up, the pc goes down. And here he is in the nowhere of the minus Tone Scale and the valence may be clear up to serenity.

And therefore, he operates in a totally psychotic way, while being totally serene. We know this case: The theetie-weetie case. Totally serene, totally batty.

What's this all about? Well, the valence is all the way up at Tone 40, and the pc is all the way down below minus 8. Now, as you audit, the valence that you're auditing out comes down and the pc starts taking over the control of that environment and that game, and he'll find out that he can play it, with this reservation: that he doesn't have to if he doesn't want to. But before that he had to play this game; he had no choice.

So you're restoring the power of choice of the pc over games. And as the pc gets out of these fixed games, he can now look around the environment and find out that he can not only play that game but that he can play other games. Now he's got more games. And if he's got more games, he'll stay Clear. And if he's got less games, that he really can play, he will go aberrated on you again.

So the total stability of clearing works out to be "how much horizon you lift for the pc in these given zones of beingness, doingness and havingness." And if you lift them all so that he's no longer aberrated along these lines, you have a stable MEST Clear. And he'll stay that way.

The very act of finishing off clearing stabilizes the Clear, because it's just more SOP Goals. More SOP Goals and more SOP Goals and more SOP Goals and more SOP Goals. You see? More goals, more beingness, doingnesses and havingnesses that are plowed in. And they start running out faster and faster and faster and faster and faster.

And the plight of this poor girl in the 3rd South African who made the first Clear down there was terrible toward the end. The auditor was in this terrible state. And she became very, very worried and finally went and saw the Instructors. For two days she had found a goal . . she had done a complete assessment on the case and had found a goal, and it was the right goal, and she'd found the right terminal, and she'd got it all set, and she'd ask the pc and it had disappeared off the meter.

What was happening? They were blowing by inspection. And they'd gotten to a state of blowing by inspection and that was all there was to it.

What do you suppose starts happening to life about that time? What do you suppose starts happening when somebody comes in . . your wife comes in or your husband comes in, or somebody says to you, "And the house has just burned down, and it's all bad, and the government's been overturned, and they're shooting all your business partners," and so forth? If that much bad luck would happen to you, which is doubtful. It wouldn't become an engram. You would probably do something effective about it and none of it would become an engram. And that would be an interesting thing to have happen, wouldn't it?

Supposing you got up even a little higher than a stable MEST Clear and an automobile ran into you. If it did . . . it'd almost have to be by your intention . . . but if it did run into you, what do you suppose would happen?

You know, it's obvious that the only thing that keeps an injury there is the engram you make of it. We've got a lot of interesting things here to find out. When you throw a body off of the wall or drop it off of a cliff, what does it do. bounce? And then what do you do. pick it up and dust it off? Or will dust stick to it? Can it retain an injury? Ah, but all injuries are retained by mental image pictures; this has been demonstrated time and time again in the last eleven years. Interesting.

But do you have to have a game to be injured? Well, if you don't have to have a game to be an injured invalid, the high probability is you can pick up your body, throw it against the wall, it bounces off . . . it just would have gone splat! in a pale pink mist, you see, previously . . . pick i-t up, dust it off and walk on down the street. Is this the kind of thing that happens?

Well, these things we don't know. But we're right there finding them out.

I was rather interested to get a letter from a Clear the other day (I didn't receive it, but it was written to somebody in the organization) and instead of saying how wonderful it all was (beyond the thing that she's getting along fine, which was a social statement), the whole thing was devoted to getting the show on the road in that particular area, and the various problems they were dealing with and how they were settling them, and how we could help out settling these various problems and straightening up the particular area. Darnedest letter you ever wanted to read, see? It's just all . . . "Well, we're being effective. We want to be effective. Now, here we go. And we're doing this and that, and you can do so-and-so and so-and-so." And there wasn't a single mention of her case beyond this social line, "How are you? I am fine," see? That was interesting too, wasn't it?

How would it feel to go around getting things done and never be worried about your case? How would that feel? Would that feel odd? Never worried about your own reaction, never worried about your consequences, never be even vaguely upset by your . . . whether you were going to get tired or confused or not.

Well, this is obviously from a person who if you'd said, "Are you tired?" she would have probably laughed at you.

"Who me? Tired? No, no, not tired."

"Well, you've been working for forty-eight hours. I thought you might be tired."

"Oh, have I? Oh yes. Yeah well, there's a lot of things to do. Now, I'll tell you...."

So a Clear, apparently, doesn't go up and sit on cloud nine. Having to play the game is what prevents one from playing the game, and evidently one can play the game as long as one doesn't have to play the game. So that's the status which is reached, which is a very interesting thing.

The perfect assessment is the first step in for a case. If you've done a perfect assessment, the case all of a sudden feels much better. If you've done an imperfect assessment, the case feels not so good. There's that indicator too. It starts in with a perfect assessment. That's the first foot on the pathway. And the first thing you run into as a possibility that the fellow is not going to make the grade is an imperfect assessment, and then that will haunt it all the way through. After that, you're in trouble from there on out.

So it's a good thing to know how to do an assessment. Be able to read an E-Meter; do an assessment; carry it on. I don't care how long it takes you to learn one. That is immaterial. I couldn't care less. But what do you know? I can show you how to do a rather rapid assessment. You've been doing assessments which bid fair to be going on for fifteen or twenty hours. Well, you can do them faster than that and still have them that accurate.

But if I show you how to do such an assessment, I don't want you to get the idea that I am trying to speed you up in doing assessments, because I don't care how long it takes you to do an assessment. But I can show you how to make it a little easier on the pc and how to make it a little faster for you, and so forth. And there are exact ways to go about this in order to do this.

Now, I'll give you an example of that: In reading repeater technique, which you use on goals and terminals assessing but not on Prehav Scale assessing . . you don't use repeater technique to find out the level of a Prehav Scale. I think I'd better put that on practically every tape we release and all the information. Bulletins . . maybe I should carry it as a footnote on all bulletins, because it seems so natural after you've done repeater technique, you see, on goals, to do repeater technique on terminals, then . . well, Prehav Scale? "Obviously, you should do repeater technique on the Prehav Scale. Everybody knows that!" That's just one of these additives.

Now, obviously, as you go down the Prehav Scale you'd hit all of these levels. If you repeated each level over and over and over and over and over, you'd really grind the fellow in, because you're auditing him on hot buttons. But that's not true of the goals and it's not true of the terminals.

So what's the best way to do a Terminals . . I mean, a Goals Assessment? Well, it's to get all of the goals. That's the first one. And then when you're sure you've got all of the goals and you've been through the list one time, get all of the goals. And after you've been through the list a second time, well, you get all of the goals. What do you mean "all of the goals"? Well, you always ask him if there aren't some more goals. Every time you go through a list of anything in the way of goals or terminals, you always add at the end of the list, as the last kickup of the heels, "What additional goals do you have?" And you run it against the meter. And if the question produces the slightest change of characteristic on your E-Meter, you say "What goal is that?" until you get it. And you flatten the meter every time you read a goals list. And you flatten the meter for new terminals every time you read a terminals list.

You always add the new goals, because he's always got new goals, until you get the right one. And after that your meter is null on new goals, and it'll stay pretty null on it. But after you've run him for a while on . . you've got the goals; you've got the terminal; you've got everything; and you then . . now get the Prehav, and you audit him for a while . . when you come back to do a new terminal, you'd better do a new Terminal Assessment and get the new terminals, because they . . are now tremendous numbers of terminals which add themselves to this goal you're trying to flatten. And when you're finally finished up with terminals for that goal, that goal is going to be flat.

Now, for your new goal: add goals, find all of the goals. In other words, it is quantitative. Find all of the goals. Every opportunity you get, find more goals. On terminals: every opportunity you get, find more terminals.

Quantity, quantity, quantity. I don't care if you have a list of 1295 goals and 15,000 terminals. I just couldn't care less. You won't achieve that. You'll probably cool off at the absolute top of about 350. That's probably the extreme.

The most I've seen right now is about 280, or something like that. But I did hear of a case just this morning that had some vast number of goals. And it was all assessed out and finally was assessed out wrong, and the question "Do you have some more goals?" produced the goal of the pc. Cool!

So quantity hasn't a single thing to do with it . . that is to say, how many you get. It's quantitative. It - you just go on. You get more. You see? It doesn't matter how many. It doesn't matter how long it takes and it doesn't matter how many you get. Just make sure that you get it all. And just make sure that when you do it, you do it so that you come out with a perfect result.

And what is a perfect result? One goal falls and one terminal falls; and you can't even get another goal, and you can't get another terminal, and that is zt.

Actually, the assessment has to be as perfect as it mechanically works out to be. It's quite mysterious that it works out so wonderfully and so mechanically to be just that. It'll turn out to be "one goal that won't go flat unless you audit it." And, of course, if you've got this one goal and then you go over the

list again and it disappears, you didn't have all the goals. That's all that means. And if you had your list of terminals, and you finally had one terminal, and there it was, and that's that one terminal, and you've really got it all done, and you say, "Well" . . . just as an afterthought . . . "Well, how do you feel about janitors?" and it goes null . . . what did that mean? It means you didn't have all the terminals, that's all. You've got to now make a new, additional terminals list and find the terminal. You have . . . all you . . . all you've got are null. Well, then you haven't got the right one, that's all.

Now, in addition to that, you have to find the terminal at both ends of the goal. Now, what do I mean by that? The terminal at both ends of the goal? The fellow has a goal "to shoot sparrows," and this turns out to be the idiotic goal that he comes up with. We don't care how sensible it is or how insensible. That's what he comes up with. His ambition and the thing to do is "to shoot sparrows." That is it. Well, it defies your reality that anybody wants to dedicate his entire existence to shooting sparrows, but as a matter of fact you probably are not aware of the fact that for centuries, for actually thousands of years, every time he marries a beautiful wife, or something of that sort, sparrows turn up in some peculiar way and ruin his marriage, and we never can figure out how this is, see? Well, that's his aberration. Don't you try to make it reasonable; that's why he's crazy. Got the idea?

All right. So that's the way it is. So you got this goal "to shoot sparrows." Now, when I say you get both ends of the goal, I mean you have to get a terminals list for the beginning and a terminals list for the end, because there's two understood terminals here. "I want to shoot sparrows." Well, the first question is "Who are you?" "Who would want to shoot sparrows?" You understand? You get the terminals list for the "I." "Who would want to shoot sparrows?"

Now, it's better if you can get that than to get the sparrows, because this thing is the cause over the sparrows, don't you see? But you might not get that. It might not be at the "I" end of this goal, it might be at the receiving end of the goal. The effect line here "to shoot sparrows" is of course sparrows.

All right, "What's a sparrow? Give me another word for sparrows."

"Well," he says, "They're birds. They're tweetie-weeties. They're our feathered friends." You got the idea? And you take that whole list of synonyms for the end. Now, but "Who would shoot sparrows?"

"Gamekeepers would shoot sparrows. And then there's cats." You get this picture of Puss-in-Boots, you know, with a shotgun.

And you say, "Cats would shoot sparrows?"

"Yes, cats would shoot sparrows. Yes, yes, definitely."

"All right." Well, after all, this is . . . this is his terminals list, not yours. So you put down "cats."

Well now, that's the way it goes. You get both ends of the terminal. See, both ends of the goal is converted into a terminal. In other words, there's really two terminal lists. But they all add up to just one terminal list. So you can ask two questions about a terminal. "Who does this?" and "What is it done to?" . . . cause-distance-effect. And you get the terminals at cause and all the terminals at effect, and you'll find out they're both present in any goal.

A fellow says, "I want to have oysters." That is the goal that finally came up: "I want to have oysters." You have to get all the synonyms in the "Hinglish" language, and if he was born a Hungarian, in the Hungarian language too, for "hoysters." And you have to find out who would have to have oysters. "Oh," he says, "Oystermen, fishmongers, uh . . . princes, uhm . . . fishermen, uh . . . people who tend oyster beds, uhm . . . little old ladies with green bonnets who sit on pedestals, and uh . . ."

Now look, it doesn't have to make sense. If it made sense, he wouldn't be aberrated on the subject. That's something for you to remember in all goals listing.

All right. Now let's take another look at how to do a fast goals list. The reading of the list is very important. If in doubt, leave it in. That is a primary rule of Goals Assessment: If in doubt, leave it in. The only mistake you can make is eradicating a goal that is still alive.

Now, to save you time . . . to save you time . . . if it rock slams on your first three repetitions of the goal or the terminal, or if it rock slams on two of those repetitions, or if it rock slams on one of those first three repetitions, leave it in. If it rock slams, leave it in; because rock slams turn on and turn off and turn on and turn off, and there's no sense in you wasting time trying to get it on again. If it slammed on it, it slammed on it, and that is all there are to it. So it slammed on a rock slam. Well, rock slams are very often sporadic. Leave it in. Simple, huh?

Now, if you get anything like three falls, the same or increasing, while reading the thing the first three times . . . the goal or the terminal . . . if you get three falls, or if it looks like it's going to go on falling, or if it looks like it is going to increase its fall, leave it in and go on to the next read. Do not try to flatten it. Got it?

But if in the first three reads of the goal or on a terminals list . . . this does not apply to the Prehav Scale . . . I want to get that note in there often . . . assessing on the Prehav Scale is done at one announcement of the level only. You don't announce a level twice; you just announce it once and take what it said.

Now, if you read three times and it was off, it was on, and it was slighter . . . you'll develop an instinct for this, (it looks like it's going to fade, doesn't it?) . . . repeat it more than three times to get it to null. But if by the time you've repeated it five or six times, and it's now starting to develop a good healthy fall, get off of it. Don't punch them to death when they keep falling. Only knock out those which appear to be in a declining, fragile state. That clear? All right. So the maximum test that you make is three reads of the goals and the terminal with no Prehav. Three reads is your maximum. Three reads of the goals list; three reads on the terminals list, and you make your determination out of those three reads. If it looks like it's going to fade, rub it out. Keep on repeating it and get rid of it. And if it looks like it's going to stay there, get off of it, and you make your adjudication on your first three reads. Got it?

On the Prehav Scale, for heaven's sakes, just say it once and mark what it fell in terms of divisions. Don't repeat a Prehav level, because you're auditing the fellow if you do . . . you're not assessing, you're auditing.

This is an old, old law, by the way. You think we've changed. Man, have we swung back to the beginning. Do you know one of the first auditing processes that ever existed was repeater technique, you know that? And on the Prehav Scale, do you know, that this . . . way back when, that you could always say a phrase once or twice to find out if it was hot without getting the pc plowed in. But if you said it four, five, six, eight, ten times, he'd had it. You'd thrown him right into the middle of the bank.

Your pc will actually continue to as-is his goals list more rapidly if you follow the system which I have just given you. What are you really doing? You're going over the list more times, and going over the questions less times. It's better to go over the list more times and the questions less times. Why? By the time you get to the end of the list you will have scummed off one entire chain. That chain will be gone. Now when you go back over the list again, you're not reading these goals now against the force of that chain. That chain is gone. So these things that are going to flatten will now flatten with greater rapidity. And you keep doing it.

It doesn't matter how many times you go over the list, you follow this same rule: Make your adjudication in the first three reads. Are you going to rub it out or are you going to leave it there? There's no great liability to making a mistake. It's just you're going to fog up the pc, and he's going to be a little less comfortable, and you're going to slow down your doing your assessment.

We don't care if you slow down doing the assessment, and we don't care if the pc gets restimulated while doing the assessment. We're just asking you to be sure. But I'm just giving you a system which will work faster. And it's real slippy. There's hardly anything to this system.

You say, "I want to shoot sparrows." There is wording that goes with this, and I'm going to give you a complete wording of this and I'll turn it out in a bulletin. There's no particular reason to give you the wording now. What you have to do is tell the pc that you're going to read a new goal (this is in essence what this is, whatever the wording turns out to be) and that you want to know how he feels about it, to . . . in order to put his attention on this goal. And you'll shift his attention faster by having a little, set patter there.

Now, I'll give you that patter in a Goals Assessment Model Session. So there's a Model Session for assessments which is slightly different . . . not enough to bother with because it's the same difference in Model Sessions as you'd get in running processes. You can change processes in Model Sessions, so you can change processes in doing assessments. You just put it in that slot. That's the way you do the assessment. That's actually how this works.

Now here's . . . here's the essence of this thing: You put his attention on it, and you say, "I'm going to go over this goal with you which is 'I want to shoot sparrows,' " see? (Eyes right on that meter, see, because that's one repetition of it.) "I want to shoot sparrows," and then you say, "How do you feel about that?" And you don't take that read. That read is null. There is no read because you haven't repeated the goal, you've asked him how he felt. But his attention is on this more strongly, so you'll get a variation in these first three reads, so you actually only have two more reads left.

You'll say, "I want to shoot sparrows. Thank you. I want to shoot sparrows. Thank you." Well, the first time you said it, it fell about three divisions on the needle, and the second time you said it it fell about four divisions on the needle, and the third time you said it it fell three divisions on the needle. Well, that's just it. You put a slant over there in the margin. You just leave it there, and you say, "Now, I want to go over this goal with you which is," and you read the next one, "I want to shoot my mother-in-law." That's one read. "How do you feel about that? 'I want to shoot my mother-in-law.' 'I want to shoot my mother-in-law.'" See? You can acknowledge it, and you better had. It's "I want to shoot my mother-in-law. Thank you. I want to shoot my mother-in-law. Thank you." And notice those three reads.

And what happened this time? Well, when you said "I want to shoot my mother-in-law," there was a nice, hard fall. And then the second time you said it, there was a little theta bop. And the third time you said it, there was a tinier theta bop. So you say, "I want to shoot my mother-in-law. Thank you. I want to shoot my mother-in-law. Thank you. I want to shoot my mother-in-law. Thank you." It's null by this time; cross it out. That goal you don't go over on the whole list again. It's gone. Got the idea?

It's not just that it changed characteristic, it actually looked like it was going to flatten. It looked like it was going to change. It looked like it was going to shift off. It looked like it didn't amount to anything

Now you get into this characteristic. You say, "I'm going to go over with . . . this goal with you: 'I want to shoot sparrows.' How do you feel about that?"

And he says, "It's really eagles."

And what do you do. scratch out "sparrows" and put in "eagles"? No, no, no. That's wrong. He's given you a brand-new goal. So you write that down underneath the goal he just gave you.

So you say, "All right. Okay. We're going to cover this sparrows goal first here. 'I want to shoot sparrows.' Thank you. 'I want to shoot sparrows.' Thank you."

This looks like it's getting tough. You know, it looks like it's strong; it's a heavy thing. So you say, "Well, we're going to leave that. And now, 'I want to shoot eagles.'" "And it falls. And you say, "I want to shoot eagles." And it falls. And "I want to shoot eagles." And it falls. So you say, " 'And I want to shoot eagles.' Thank you." And " 'I want to shoot eagles.' Thank you." And " 'I want to shoot eagles.' Thank you." All right, we'll take that one off! It's scrubbed. This is quite ordinary that you'll get a sudden alter-is in the middle of a goals run. Okay?

Now, reading the list over more times and spending a little less time grinding on it will actually speed up your assessment. That's in the interests of speeding up an assessment, but these interests are not very great.

Now, what ho you communicate this information so that people can do it without additives or alter-is?

I'll give you some simple rundown: I say, "Well, you look at the pc fixedly and sneeze and that fixes it all up, you see?" That's all dandy. And then what do I hear? "Well, do you sneeze in E-flat minor?" "What is the violence and duration of the sneeze?" "Is this done in an auditing session? Do you use Model Session form to put this sneeze in? Or is it a special form?" "Now, this, of course, isn't bounded by the Audiappens if you get down to the end on the sixteenth read of the list, and there were only. . . See, when you go over it the next time, you only read those goals that have a slant in front of them which said they still read. You use the same principles in going over this. He had 120, they have now boiled down to 40, on maybe three reads. He's got 40 left. Go over these 40, and they all go null, null, null, null. "Oh, there's one. Okay, that one stayed." Null, null, stayed, stayed, stayed, stayed. Oh, they say, "That's fine. That's dandy." And you get down to the end of this thing, you ask him, "Do you have any more goals," see, "that you haven't mentioned before?"

Now he says, "No, no. No, no." And the needle is quite flat on this.

So you go over the remaining goals and there are now 12. And you go over these things, and you say, "Well..." . . same formula . . and, "Scrubbed, and that one scrubbed, and that one scrubbed, and that one scrubbed. That one stayed. Okay!"

All right. And when you get over that list, you ask him if there are any more goals, and he says, "No," and the needle is nice and null. And so you go back over it again and you now find out there are three. And you go over it, and it's scrub, scrub, scrub.

Now, this is the kind of a problem you'll get into. That'll happen less ordinarily than you will have one left. But when you get into that, the proper thing to do is say, "What other goals are you withholding that you haven't told me about?"

"Oh, that I haven't told you about? Oh, that's different." For some reason or other, this is all different now. Well, what you actually did was pull the goals chains off the line, and you've simply been taking the overburden off of his goals. And not until it was all gone did you find you had some new goals sitting there staring you in the face.

So you can add this rule to assessment: That when you've got the goal, and you know exactly what it is, and you've got it in a total box and that is it . . you could set it up in bright lights, neon signs, put huge seamen's floodlights on it; you're absolutely certain now; you've got it absolutely set; you have done everything you have been told to do that you've learned to do and that you've dreamed up, and you know that's it . . ask for some more goals, ask for some more terminals. And put them down and assess them . . first goals list, then terminals . . assess them against the one you had. Because I'll tell you this little rule: Any goal which is to put up a mock-up (because of the Prehav Scale) is liable to be a false one and is a dangerous one to audit. And it is perishable because the result of failure is to create a mock-up one's own self. That is the result of failure.

So that you get into an arts goal, this is particularly true. And just as a broad category, this most succinctly and desperately, for some reason or other, applies to arts goals. You'll learn a lot of this bric-a-brac about how to judge these things, but this is a very important one because you should always be suspicious of an arts goal. The guy isn't even putting up a mass mock-up, don't you see? He's putting up a figure-figure sort of a think-think. He's going to write music. I wouldn't ever leave anybody with a goal of writing music. He's going to sing . . I wouldn't leave a guy with a goal of singing. I would just start beating that goals list to pieces! This is what experience has taught me.

Why? Because there's always the thing you can do when all else fails, and that's usually the arts. Now, isn't that a hell of a thing? That's an awful commentary on the arts, but I don't intend it to be a commentary on the arts. The Renaissance in Italy takes place after it's beaten by France. Nobody can

now make machinery or masses or really put up this or get a society on the road but they could paint pictures. Got the idea? So they're going to start to overwhelm with aesthetic masses. Actual masses didn't work so they're going to go into aesthetic masses. And those are closer to the thought band.

I don't say that a preclear will never in the history of SOP Goals turn out to have an arts goal, because that's not justified. I just say it's something to regard with grave suspicion . . . not in life, but on an assessment.

If you go just a little further, you'll find you've improved the case enough with an assessment that he gets into a better goal channel. That's what it amounts to. Got the idea? So that all arts goals . . . as one single, whole category . . . should, if encountered, demand additional assessment. Just beat it to pieces without invalidating the pc. Ask him for some more goals.

There's all kinds of ways to ask for goals. I won't go into those today, but "What did you want to do before you'd started to sing?"

"Oh. Well, that's not possible." Claaaang! And you'll find out they usually have an answer to it. What did they want to do before they went into the arts? What did they really want to do?

Now, this also applies to these figure-figure professions like law, philosophy, these other professions. Things that are in a thought band exclusively and only, such as arts, and that sort of thing . . . ah, it's a very featherweight goal, man. It's pretty featherweight. It denotes a hell of a failure just ahead of it. But that isn't any reason why it won't turn out to be that on some pcs. It won't . . . isn't any reason why it couldn't be the perfect assessment in the long run. But it is something that very easily blows while assessing, and you can find something more solid to run, and your assessment has actually accomplished some auditing. So it's something to just be suspicious of, not something to eradicate.

All right, now let's go into this just one more tiny step, and we will find out that a perfect Goals Assessment gets the right goal and the right terminal so that the case can be run. That's what it does. And there's only one set that unlocks the case. And if you run the wrong one, you will find out about it. So the thing to do is, if the case is not running right, to do another assessment. There is no harm in doing this because if the right assessment was done the first time, oddly enough, no matter how violently you assess on the second time (if you do it in Model Session, picking up the ARC breaks, present time problems, and the other things which you're supposed to do), you're going to get the same goal on the second assessment. And if it was the wrong one, it probably is gone by this time.

What mistakes, then, can you make in modern processing? You can make the mistakes of attempting auditing without your TRs, E-Meter and Model Session in perfect condition. That leads and breeds many other mistakes.

Your next mistake is you can fail to achieve a perfect assessment. It doesn't mean that you have to do it perfectly with your little pinky in the air and just exactly this and that. It doesn't matter how adroitly you do this. The perfection totally consists of achieving the result of the right goal and the right terminal for that pc. Now, if you've got that, you've got it made.

That's what I mean by "perfect assessment" . . . not doing a perfect job of assessing, because you could probably achieve the right assessment by doing an imperfect job of assessing as long as you were bulldoggish enough to carry it through to its conclusion and to be absolutely sure. If you have any doubt in your own mind about the rightness of the assessment for any reason under the sun . . . except, of course, that you yourself would hate to be that terminal. We've already found that. Person finally got it.

And when you're absolutely sure that this is the only thing that's going to shake out of that case, and that's the last thing that's going to shake out of that case, and that's the only thing that's going to shake out of that case, and the only thing that can disturb this now is auditing on the Prehav Scale . . . when you're absolutely sure . . . then start auditing. Until that time, continue to assess; no matter how boring or how upset the pc gets, or anything else, continue to assess. Keep the ARC breaks picked up; keep the present time problems picked up; get the withholds off the case; get it whizzing, and keep on assessing till you are sure. You and the meter know; the pc does not.

Now, the pc may speak during an assessment. But that's practically the limit of how it enters into an auditor's judgment. Now, I've had a lot of experience with this, and amongst the experience is pcs becoming wildly enthusiastic about some goal, and wildly enthusiastic about some terminal. "Oh, a balloon jumper! Boy, that's the thing, you know?" They're right in the middle of the wheeee, you see? "A person who jumps from a balloon and comes down in parachutes. Oh-ho boy, that's it. I know that's it. All my life . . . It explains everything. It's just it."

The next read it drops out. You say, "How do you feel about balloon jumpers?"

"What balloon jumpers?" It's discouraging from that point of view.

Now, I want you to do assessing. I don't care whom you grab by the ear and start to assess. I don't care who gets assessed. I don't care how badly they get assessed or how well they get assessed in terms of technology . . . the waving of the pinky, how you hold the E-Meter, the expression in your left eye, to say nothing of the expression in your right eye. We don't care anything about those things. What we care about is that perfect assessment at the other end. And carry it on down. If you do one of these, you'll find out you'll give a case an enormous advance. If it's a perfect assessment, the case gets an enormous advance. They say "Coo!" you see, it's some terrific cognition, you know? "This is what I am doing! Well! Well! What do you know!"

Sometimes it's the first "What do you know!" you had off the case. Maybe he's been audited five hundred hours before and he never said, "What do you know!" He just said, "Yes. No." And he gets up to a state where he really has . . . he really has some idea of where he's going and what he's doing. You don't have to tell him that's his goal. The E-Meter and he will find that out. Now, he isn't going to find it out until after you've found it out, because you're plowing right into the middle of this fellow's beingness. Crash.

So I want you to do. at the drop of a hat, an assessment. I don't care if you start assessments on people and never finish them on that particular person. We'll get him someday. You haven't loused him up. You haven't loused him up. We can now do a complete assessment. You can take an assessment that another auditor has done, just scrap it and do another assessment of your own: If his assessment's right, you'll get the same answer if your assessment's right. It doesn't matter how many times you assess.

Now, the only time an assessment goes wrong was when it was absolutely right and it was audited for a few hours and that was the end of that terminal, and now you can't assess for the same terminal. You may get some other terminal for the same goal, but it already is showing up on the case. The case is advancing if this occurs. The case feels much better; the case looks much different.

SOP Goals running is very rapid, and you can tell the difference in the people, and you can tell the advances. Okay?

All right. Now, if over this weekend you have a perstor's Code is it?" And particularly, "This changes, of course, everything we have been doing before."

Those things are pretty inevitable. Now, I don't mean to be sarcastic. I'm just showing you what happens . . . I'm not being sarcastic because this is too true; it is too painfully true.

And it works like this: You, in trying to equate a relatively simple fundamental in Scientology at this time, are, of course, picking up a fundamental which sits right in the middle of anybody's case. And you tend to blow off a little bit of a confusion, you know, in trying to grab hold of it. And it isn't as if I were teaching you how to run a diesel engine. What little oddball ideas you had about diesel engines would blow off in a hurry. I could teach you how to run a diesel engine . . . very complicated . . . to even you girls, you see? Just bang. It'd be hardly anything to it. I'd show you: Well, there's this and there's that and there's the other thing. I'd have to read a book and find out how myself first. But that would be very easy.

But if you both are sitting, innocently, and there's an E-Meter anywhere to be found, you might ask him this searching question, rather speculatively, "What do you suppose your main goal in life might be? Oh, you don't know. Well, let's find out, shall we?" That's enough excuse for doing a Goals Assessment.

And you'll find out that where people before maybe didn't volunteer at once to be guinea pigs, or something, for auditing - you might have had some resistance . . you almost never have resistance on that question about goals. Okay?

Audience: Yes. Hmm.

I think Khrushchev himself could be put into session with this one.

Okay?

Audience: Yeah.

Thank you.