

## GOALS AND TERMINALS ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on  
14 September 1961

Okay. This is 14 Sept., AD 11, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And there's nothing much to talk to you about today. And probably you should all go home. There's hardly anything to learn. It's too much. And besides, if you did learn it, what could you do with it?

People would get Clear. Just people would get Clear, that's all. Something horrible happen.

You got a new routine that is going to require of you some additional skills. And that routine, I repeat, consists of setting the pc down, finding the pc's goal, finding the pc's terminal, assessing the Prehav level and running the Prehav level. And then assessing for engrams the pc has been in valence in. And then handling the various engrams one by one.

And now we come to a question mark. How soon we return to the Prehav general runs after we've done that? It's not been determined. But I'll tell you this: you'll see a pc's needle get awful loose after you've run a couple of engrams. Boy, it starts getting awful loose. I'd say offhand it probably depends on the pc to a marked degree, how many engrams you run him before you run back to the general run of things. Because after you've run one or two engrams, of course, the pc is going to be in some sort of a . . well, he's going to have all kinds of locks and everything stacked up and a whole new set of engrams. And you find the pc changes gradually. They lose their chronic somatics at first. And then they lose their chronic emotional difficulties. And third or fourth engram, why, they probably lose some other things and start to get down to cases on the thing.

And then if you do another general run, assess again on the Prehav level and do the general run on their terminal once more, you'll probably come up with some more . . an interesting series of engrams again. And then you have to do the same thing.

Theoretically, the engrams should run faster and faster. They should do better and better. And we're into a phase of it which we've had trouble with before. And that is getting somebody to run an engram. And we have the answer to that. Get subjective reality on being in some engrams and you won't have any difficulty running them. Trying to run an engram without any subjective reality winds up in ARC breaks and upsets of magnitude, but nevertheless can be done and will have to be done in some places of the world. All right.

Now, that general a rundown, of course, is flanked by Security Checks.

The whole thing is flanked by Security Checks. Everything about it: Running engrams, general Prehav run, terminal checking, goals checking . . just to run it backwards. That's all flanked by Security Checks.

What ratio of Security Check and so forth? Well, the more difficult it was to get a pc in-session, the more I'd concentrate on Security Check. See, the more . . that's a proportionate amount. If the pc is difficult to get into session, or difficult to keep in-session, I would just come down on that Security Check with spiked boots, because that's where it lies. That's where you're going to get the fastest release of anything.

And if you can't seem to get anyplace on a Security Check, there is an extreme form of Security Check known as the Not Know version of Security Checks. I wouldn't advise running it. Now that you're running engrams, there is no point in running the other, because you'll run him into two or three different chains. If you start running Not Know, you see, on engrams and that'd carry forward one set of engrams and then terminal carries forward another set and it's all kind of messy. And if you're going to run anything like engrams, I'd just run them on the terminal line. That's where they appear.

Now, let's look it over. What's made this . . what's made this activity possible? We were steered widely out of course by auditors taking forever to assess, or auditors taking no time at all to assess. This is . .

lecture is on assessment, Goals Terminal Assessment. I'm just following the routine down. Yesterday I took up Security Checks. Today, why, I'll take up Goals and Terminal Assessments.

We were steered wildly out of our course by auditors . . . number one, first instance . . . just assessing I don't know what! Get some old tomato can off the shelf and gaze at their reflection in it or something and say, "Well, that's your goal and that's your terminal and you've had it."

And then that went to the other Aristotelian extreme of, well, 285 hours later we're still assessing for the goal.

Somewhere in between that is the best amount. But if you take more than ten or twelve hours for assessing for a goal, I can tell you very, very plainly that your rudiments are out.

Now, Washington course, you know, had thirty students and throughout the course . . . in the course of thirty hours; they probably only got about thirty hours of auditing per student in that six weeks' course on goals . . . and during that thirty hours, they found not one goal. There was no cross-checking on rudiments in that course, unlike the 22nd American, unlike the South African course. Similarly, very few goals were found on the Melbourne course and I don't know positively whether or not they checked rudiments on each other or not, but I would say not. If they did, it was very ineffectual.

And it boils down to this. Although the Instructors of the Washington course are very incredulous . . . they are sort of uhhuagh-hhgh on the communication lines now. "Well, were certain people in the course that we found the goals and terminals on . . . well, were the goals and terminals in their first 150 list and . . . ?" you know, they're just . . . just don't believe it. They just don't believe it. It just is not possible for them to comprehend that every one of their students had their rudiments out.

Now, what they're not estimating is the delicacy of the goal and how rapidly it disappears from sight. And you've either got to be a very skilled auditor with terrific altitude or you've got to have the rudiments in. Take your choice. I can get goals and terminals with the rudiments out. All right. That's simply a question of altitude. The degree of altitude you have over your pc is the degree you can keep him in-session. And that is the whole story of how to get the goal and terminal.

But if you sit there and apparently don't know what you're doing and you're very unpositive, you know, you take the E-Meter and say, "Well, let's see, now. Where's . . . see the instruction book over here. see and so on and so on and so on. Hm-mm-hm-mm-hm-mm-hm-mm-m. What's this? Oh. Oh, I haven't got the cans plugged in. Now, here are the . . . these are the what? The uh . . . cans. I don't know . . . why are these called cans?" you ask the pc.

You haven't got any altitude anymore. It's gone. you just poured it down the sink. And that's the end of it. All you've got to do is sit there, unconfident and you get an inconfident preclear. All you've got to do is look stupid and sound stupid and you'll have a stupid session as an auditor. That's the whole works.

You've got to know your business. And the degree that you inspire confidence in the pc is actually just the degree that you know your business, the degree you could do the TRs, the degree you can do Model Session, the degree of familiarity with which you handle the E-Meter, the positiveness and directness of your questions to the pc. These things are all altitude. If you want to know what altitude is, it has nothing to do with your past record. You can have the most marvelous past record in the world. And you sit down in front of this pc, fumble with the E-Meter, fumble the command, be unconfident in your handling of the pc and you have no altitude. So altitude is never automatic.

Altitude is made. And it is made right in session, every session, by the expertness with which you do the session. And if you want altitude, all you've got to do is do a letter-perfect session. And that's all there is to altitude. Because that itself inspires confidence in the pc. That's well worth knowing, isn't it?

Don't let me ever hear you say, now, any of you, "Well, if I were just Ron I could get this done in a hurry." You just say instead, "Well now, if I acted like I knew my business well enough, I would get this done in a hurry." Okay? Because look, I've got no altitude with some of the Pullman car porters I've audited. They don't know me from Adam. You know? Lots of the people I've audited . . . they never heard

of me, they never heard of Scientology, they never . . . nothing. Yet they respond immediately and at once. Bang! Well, why? Why? Well, because I don't fumble. That's about the only thing you can say about it.

Also there's very high R. I keep a very high R in a session. Reality up, up, up. I don't get chatty or nonsensical with the pc, but I am apt to be slightly didactic in a session. Not overwhelming, but just to keep the R up. If I don't think the pc is acting right, I'm liable to ask him "Why aren't you in-session?" You know? I'm sitting there wondering why they're not in-session, so I ask him why they're not in-session.

This R-factor is such a tremendous factor and is so little appreciated and so little understood, that a person's auditing will be incomprehensible to him in that it's apparently good with one pc . . . or on one day and not good on another pc, or on another day with the same pc. you see, it's his auditing skill is . . . goes over the rolly coaster. Well, that's because his R goes over the rolly coaster; his reality on the subject goes over the rolly coaster. A pc can always tell. And so forth.

Well, I gave a session last night, if the pc doesn't mind my remarking on it. And the pc was at once struck with the fact that we were not going along as smoothly as we had the session before. Well, there's no question about the fact that the R was out. But it was out between me and the session. It wasn't out with . . . much with the pc, it was out between me and the session.

Now, how was it out between me and the session? I didn't know what the hell to do! Two nights before I had this pc in an engram . . . night before . . . had the pc perfectly, right there. Had it all spotted and identified, all ready to run.

Next session I was going to take it up. Of course, that's a little mistake in itself (to locate an engram and not run it, see?). But not much of a mistake. You'll find yourself doing it quite often. It's unavoidable. And set the pc down and, "What do you see?"

"Well I see blackness."

"What's going on?"

"Nothing."

What reactions can a guy get on a meter? Nothing. I start talking about this incident. Nothing. I get nowhere and I suddenly say, "Where the hell am I and what are we doing?" Well, I didn't express it aloud too much and the R went out just like that. But I myself was totally baffled. What the hell was going on? Pc was of no assistance whatsoever. Quite . . . quite usual in running the type of engram you run into.

The pc says, "Well, I just don't know." And that's it. You're not even asking him a not-know question. "I just don't know." And then the pc will get restive too, when you've located an engram perfectly and the pc right in it and then you hit the same engram and the pc can't find it.

Pc says, "What's happening?"

Well, of course, to some slight degree, they blame the auditor. "Why don't you take me and shove me into this engram?" You know, that's . . . kind of a thing

Well, what engram? How could I shove a pc into an engram I couldn't locate, identify, do anything with? I mean that engram was a szszszsz.

You say, "What are you looking at?"

He says, "I'm looking at blackness."

"Yeah. Well, good. Now, where's this . . . go to the point where something or other was happening the last time," or something like that.

“What do you see?”

“Nothing Blackness.”

Well, let's see what we can find in this. Well, in the first place, you're not . . . you're not looking for a needle in a haystack. A person who's looking for a needle in a haystack is looking for a needle. See, he knows it's a needle. Well, looking for an engram, you don't know what the hell you're looking for a lot of the time. you just don't know what you're looking for, because that's the keynote of an engram: “Don't know.” Pc can't tell you. He can't find out on the meter and you yourself don't know. Now what?

All right. So the R-factor went out and it was a little bit difficult to keep the pc in-session. Because my reality factor went out because it startled me. And then I never remarked on it to the pc, see? It did startle me. was the pc in the engram? Wasn't the pc in the engram? Had we lost the engram? Was there something else? Were we on some kind of a chain? What was the matter here?

Of course, it worked out the pc was in the engram and the engram didn't have anything much about it. It was just totally dark. It was all black. It was black for a whole lifetime. The pc was blind. There were no remarkable somatics. There was nothing very dramatic except how the pc had lost her eyesight and that was done under an anesthetic and that was unrecoverable. Took three hours to run the engram which was kind of a championship run.

And I finally even resorted to lock scanning and some other tricks. Not lock scanning. I scanned the pc through that whole lifetime several times, trying to make the pc hang on the point of trauma. Pc never hung Just the pc would keep running into these things and learning more about it and ran emotion and things. “When were you apathetic?” Yeah, you know? And so forth. Ran off emotional curves. Did everything I could think of And we finally got it. And we got it all straight and it was the damndest story anybody had ever heard of It almost made me sick at my stomach. But there it was. There it was.

But the R-factor went out, basically, because I wasn't too frank with the pc because I was taken totally by surprise. You find the engram, there it is. It has the somatics, it's all properly registered, it's got a picture, it's got visio . . . there's everything with it. And you say, “Well, well catch it next session.” Next session, “What engram? Where?” Pc was right in it. That was the trouble with the whole thing Nothing ever happened. Pc totally dependent on visio . . . no visio. Sonic shut off Emotional downcurve, everything else. All right.

Now, I could have done better on this. you can always do better. You always have a six-foot rearview mirror with a tiny little peephole in the front.

And I could have said, “Well, this is awfully odd here. It's a . . . we had it and . . . where is it? Where is the point we had last night? And, you know? I'm puzzled about this,” and possibly the R-factor would have gone up. I don't know whether it would have or not, but it would have made an easier session. Well, it wasn't difficult to run this session. Nothing happened except it just wasn't a very high-powered session. And it took about three hours to run the thing, see. But I think it would have taken three hours to have run it anyhow, because it was a whole lifetime from earliest childhood to complete adulthood, all blind, on a pc who was totally dependent on visio. Well, that was a rough one to crack. Not many somatics connected with it. Nothing very dramatic that way. All right.

The R-factor has a great deal to do with this. The auditor in this case was suddenly uncertain. You wouldn't have been uncertain. I had a horror when I got halfway through running this . . . “How in the name of God one of these auditors in the class would run this thing, you know?” Because, brother, I was using the whole lousy lot, you know? I was using the whole book of tricks from A to izzard. You know, I was running emotional curves and I was running Not Know in all different kinds of fashions and I was using scanning . . . not scanning through engrams, but scanning through a lifetime. And you know, you scan somebody through a lifetime and he'll hang up in the moment of trauma, see.

And you say, “Well, go to the beginning of this thing. Now scan rapidly on through to the end of that life,” and he'll hang up in the engram necessary to solve that life, you see?

And the engram was a whole lifetime and I'd never expected this breadth. I thought I had about . . . you know, I didn't think about it very hard. I thought maybe I got an hour or two, see? An hour or two of a lifetime. Oh, no, no, no, nothing like that. Something on the order of . . . I don't know . . . sixty, seventy years. Pc finally had a cognition and the pc exteriorized from the body and could see again. Why, she had the cognition . . . well, she said to herself, you know, "Well, why didn't I do that a long time ago, you know? Why did I live that lifetime at all?" That was what it amounted to.

But the pc was on a chain, where the pc's taking it all for granted. See? It since . . . that chain is very usual to the pc and is very outrageous to the auditor. It's fantastic! See?

And the pc says, "Oh, yes, yes." Something on the order of "Well, they took the Empire State Building and parked it on a cloud and it sailed away, you know?"

And the pc is going on with perfectly usual, ordinary activities, you know. "So they took a drink of water," you see, is the way it sounds to the pc going through it, you see? And to the auditor it says, "Well, so then they took liquid fire and poured it into everybody's eardrums," you see. It's just going . . . just completely jarred out. So the R-factor couldn't have helped but be out in the engram. And only somebody with a natively high R-factor, you might say, could have kept it in. But I had horrors. I said, "How in the name of God could they run this one?"

In the first place, they would have said to the pc, "What are you looking at?"

Oog-h! And the pc would have said, "Blackness" and "I don't know."

And just about ten, fifteen minutes with that type of questioning after it, you would have been absolutely certain . . . almost all of you . . . would have been absolutely certain there was no engram there. And the pc is sitting right in the middle of it. And you would have gone off and tried to run another engram, your pc would have ARC broke and that would have been that! So it was a dynamite situation. It's tricky. It's tricky.

All right. Well, you can confront that in due course, but confront first how to find a goal. And the R-factor is terribly important when you run an engram, but it is even more important when you are running goals.

In the first place, Homo sap, apparently, gets in a games condition about goals, so the R-factor will drop.

"What goals have you had? Go ahead. List your goals. I dare you. Oh. Oh." I tell you, auditor reality would have been pretty bad to smother them, but auditor reality can be very bad while doing somebody else's goals because it's sort of a native games condition. Won't let the pc have a goal. Apparently, that's what it adds up to. So you just have to overcome this and somehow or another keep a high R and do everything you're doing very positively and very confidently. And the way to do things positively and confidently is very simple: just know your business. In order to be positive and confident, all you have to do is be superlatively good at your business.

And what is your business? All right. This is very simple. Got to have your TRs, your Model Session and know exactly what you're doing with a Goals Assessment. If you know those things, you look confident and if you're willing to let the pc have a goal . . . and if you're having difficulty getting the pc's goal, why don't you just ask yourself that question? "Am I let . . . willing to let this pc have his goal?" Why, you'll find out you can get this goal. Now, that is a different approach than rudiments in.

I just call it to your attention here that this is another approach. This comes under the head of altitude. How much altitude do you have while you're auditing the pc? Well, you have as much altitude as you are competent. And that is all the altitude you will ever have. You're competent also in that session. Your competence cannot go on automatic. All right. Now, that is another approach and if you can keep your competence level up and not stumble and bumble about the whole thing and do a proper job of it, you'll find out that the goal doesn't disappear. See?

Now you've got another whole angle of it, is you buck this up with the rudiments and you make the rudiments very good. And you make it so the pc doesn't have any immediate withholds from you. Pc is willing to talk to the auditor, able to talk to the auditor. And get those rudiments in. Get those in real good. Make sure the pc doesn't have a present time problem and so forth. You can spend quite a bit of time on that. And then get your Goals Assessment done.

Now, let me call to your attention a mistake that was made on the Washington course, which was just conducted. And that is, they were evidently, from the records Mary Sue was looking at, were doing a tremendous amount of Security Checking under the guise and heading of rudiments.

Now, how the hell anybody managed that, I don't know. But it had nothing to do with the price of fish. The withhold that you are looking for while doing the rudiments, is the withhold from you personally which will make the pc unwilling to talk to you in the session.

You aren't looking for all of the withholds of the life. That is why you run a Security Check entirely independent of your normal sessions. You are not trying to do a Security Check while you are doing rudiments. And of course, you would foul up like mad.

As much as eighteen hours of the thirty hours devoted to looking for goals, in the Washington course, was devoted to rudiments. And that is just balderdash! I don't mind saying so, but it was all devoted to doing Security Checks.

Can you think of any better way to deny a pc a goal? Isn't that interesting? You get up so far in the rudiments and you say, "Well, are you withholding anything from me?" something like that.

And pc doesn't have any fall at all. There's no reaction.

And you say, "Well, come now, you must be withholding something from somebody."

"Ah, well, put it that way, yes."

See, you'd never get around to doing a Goals Assessment. Hm-hm-hm-hm. Smart, huh?

Now, if you go on past that withhold button, you want to know what the pc is withholding from you. Right now! And you see, the rudiments are all nownesses. The present time of the rudiments and so forth . . . the present time problem, as addressed in the rudiments . . . means a situation which exists now in the physical universe. Whether it's long or short durations, it must have a nowness about it.

Now, the one thing we have stepped a little bit wide Tom on this is the rudiment concerning ARC breaks, because you'll find that the pc has had a limited auditing track, a very limited auditing track: a few hundred, at most, a thousand or two at the absolute outside. Some old-timer might possibly come around with a fifteen-hundred-hour auditing track. In view of the fact that you've got a pc who has had many ARC breaks with other auditors, it is better to ask, "What haven't you been able to tell an auditor?" and "When?" You see, it's much better to approach it that way.

But you will find out that you can also play this one to death. After you've done that with a pc once and have gotten the backtrack off, you should shorten that rudiment to "me," not an auditor. "What haven't you been able to tell me? When was that?" See. You just cut down your track.

Now, the others under the heading, sort of a crossed-up thing, of straightening up auditing with the pc at the same time that you were running rudiments. So remember that it's got a double barrel. The proper rudiment is just "me."

See, the rudiments are actually addressed to keeping the auditor in-session with the pc . . . reversewise. Now the auditor has confidence that the pc is not going to go out of session, so of course he keeps the pc in-session. That's the basic purpose of the rudiments. Nobody laughed.

No, it just has to do with that session. The rudiments ordinarily have to do with that session, that auditor. And then, on a gradient scale, it's that session, that auditor, auditors. Don't go outside the realm of the auditing session or auditing sessions, if you really want to start doing fast rudiments and keep them in. Because that's the rudiments that will be out. All you're trying to do with rudiments is not solve a case. You're trying to set up a session so the pc will be in session during that session. That is all.

Now, you will find it necessary to establish a willingness to be a pc, on a lot of people. Well, what's he willing to be and what is he unwilling to be? That goes a long way. That becomes a process. If you needle-flatten it, it is adequate for your purposes. If you tone arm-flatten it, of course you run the whole case.

You get the difference between these two things? So don't . . . I've altered that little thing in my notes. I don't know if I passed it along to you in that form. But it is just needle-flatten all rudiments. Rudiments get needle-flattened. Processes get tone arm-flattened.

Well, what's needle-flattened? Well, when you don't . . . when you ask the question again, do you get a needle reaction? You don't get a needle reaction, so you don't ask the question again. Now, that's fairly simple, isn't it? Nothing much to that.

So, let's take a look at this and realize that the first and foremost necessity is a competent auditor, who does know what he's doing and a pc who is in-session with that auditor, even though he might not be in-session with some other auditor. That's your second requirement.

And then actually let the pc have his goal. Don't go cat-and-mousing around about the thing. Let him have his goal. The goal will appear, ordinarily, in the first 150 and boy, that is a wide figure. I mean, that is a big figure. I think it ordinarily occurs in the first 50. But I'm just saying 150 just to take care of exceptions.

Let him have it. If you haven't found it in that length of time, then assume, one, that you apparently haven't any altitude with this pc and two, that the rudiments are out.

Well, now how do you solve the altitude? Well, you solve the altitude with the pc by doing a competent job. And you get the pc in-session, of course, by getting the rudiments competently done. That's all.

And if I didn't get his goal within the first 150 goals a pc gave me, I would just go back and beat the rudiments to death on a whole basis. In other words, I would . . . I would just hit this willingness to be a pc, you see, with . . . that particular facet. What's wrong with the auditor is the unwillingness of the pc to be a pc.

I'd make sure that the present time problems and so forth were at least kicked out a little bit. I'd make sure of all of these various points in the rudiments. I would just beat them to death and I'd go back and do the same Goals Assessment all over again. Got it?

I don't know that I would let somebody else check the rudiments, but . . . seem rather dull. But you might have somebody else check the rudiments just in case they're only in with you or something, but aren't really in with you, or some goofball situation like this that you can't quite undo the lock of.

What is this? Means the pc has become wary of giving you his goal, or the pc has become very distracted from the subject of goals. That's all it means. You haven't got the pc's goal in the first 150? Well, the pc has become distracted.

Now, Goals by Elimination is a perfectly valid way of finding goals. But this can be carried to much, much too great a length. You can do Goals by Elimination just by reading the list, each goal once. Do you realize that? Read the list over and over and over. And you'll still do a Goals Assessment by Elimination. You don't have to add repeater technique to it. It'll eventually work out. Actually, there's hardly even any time to be won. And if you find the pc is getting edgy about repeater technique, well, just start reading the goals list from beginning to end. Simple. Check each one and say, "Well, that one's in and that one isn't in," and so forth and so on.

Go back to the beginning of it and read the goals list again. You'll find those that were in have now dropped out. And gradually it'll boil down to the one that's in and that's it. Because only one goal is going to register.

Now, there is a worse crime than doing a long Goals Assessment and finally finding the goal. There is a worse crime. And that is doing a stinking, lousy, hit-or-miss, who cares, wrong Goals Assessment. Now you can really louse up a pc. That just wastes the whole works. And it does worse than that. It actually harms the pc.

So do a careful Goals Assessment. And I won't say then that you should rush the Goals Assessment up just to get within ten hours or that sort of thing. At the end of ten hours, you're not sure, well, keep on going. But remember, you've already got the pc's goal when you've had the first 150 and that's for sure. It would be a very unusual and rare case that it went any further than that.

You keep asking the pc for goals, you're just bludgeoning him. You're bludgeoning him with more goals you want. More goals. More goals. More goals. More goals. You can always add goals to the list. But don't knock a person apart, because he can't think of any. And that was one of the symptoms that was turning up on these endless assessments.

Auditor would finish the list and then demand more goals. He'd say, "Well, have you got any more goals?" and the pc would get a needle reaction.

Look, the needle reaction was on "For Christ's sakes, I haven't got any more goals!" See? It was a needle reaction on an ARC break.

And then the auditor would sit there and say, "Well, what is that goal?" What goal? Hell! I could have given it to him if I had been the pc at the time, you see? "I'd wring your neck, man!" You see? Just as blunt as that. Because that's what it amounts to.

You get an ARC break read and you say, well, there's more goals. And that nonsense can actually continue by actual test for about 150 hours. Pretty grim, huh?

There aren't any more goals. All there are, are ARC breaks but they never get cleaned up, don't you see? Every time your needle falls, well, you say, "Well, there must be more goals," but actually it's falling on an ARC break. And the pc does want to find what his goal is, so he somehow or another holds him in-session and he's more or less on auto by this time. See, the rudiments are wildly out when you get into this kind of a situation.

No sir. you go over a very elementary routine here and without adding anything much to it, why, you will find the pc's goal. It is . . . of course, from my viewpoint, I'm explaining to you how to find a white pebble in the middle of a black desert. You see? It just isn't possible for anybody not to be able to do this, you know? Because of that impossibility, I eventually had to assign it to that one. There's some kind of a goals condition going on here . . . which is a super games condition. It's a specialized condition that relates to one human being letting another human being have a goal. And it's even gotten into auditing, which shocks me, you know, because I've never seen anything else get into auditing like this. Must be, though. It was happening all the way around the world.

The first list of how you got the pc's goal is so simple; there's nothing much to it. I mean, so you got the pc to give you a list of goals and then you went over them and found out the one that fell the most and that was the pc's goal. Auditors couldn't do that. Don't think they can. I don't think they can now, because they read cognition surges and all sorts of things on these things. Pc gets a new goal and he gets a hell of a surge, you see. "Hey, what do you know? I . . . when I was nine years old I wanted to blow up the local bank! Hey, what do you know, you know? I did." you know, he gets a big fall.

And the auditor says, "Well, that's his goal" and writes it down. That's it. And then says, "Well, all right. What's the terminal for this? Who would blow up a bank?"



“And . . . and who’d blow up a bank?” “Oh, uh . . . I guess, uh . . . bank robbers. Uh . . . yeah.”

“Bank robbers would, huh? Well, who else would blow up a bank?”

“Well, I guess uh . . . most anybody would blow up a bank.”

“Oh, anybody? Good, I’ll write that one. Uh . . . uh . . . who . . . who’d be capable of blowing up a bank?”

“Well, my mother would be.”

“Ah! Your mother. Good. That’s it.”

And of course they got a big fall on it because the person had a . . . “That’s odd. My mother. It flashes into mind she’d blow up a bank. That’s very peculiar.” And you get a big fall, you see. The fall’s never repeated, by the way. The fall would never repeat on the bank and it’d never repeat on this terminal.

So they assess mother on the Prehav Scale . . . this usually with great care, taking eight or nine hours to do this one. Get all the levels totally reacting, you see, and then pick out one, kind of at random and then run it, you know?

Next time they do the assessment, why, they got 15 levels live and they run on that level for a little while. Next time they do the assessment, they got 24 levels live and they do the assessment and run it again. And now they got the whole scale live and the pc is spinning in.

Just . . . this is actually the way it was going. So I developed Assessment by Elimination and I found out it worked and proved it out to myself and found out that this was the way it worked and I could do it very easily and it actually made my job easier too, and that was dandy. And that is to say you took these 30, 40, 50, 60, 100 goals the pc gave you and you eliminated them. And you found out oddly enough that they would all eliminate. Every single one of them would eliminate, except the pc’s goal. And I figured, well, nobody could make a mistake doing that, so that was released that way. And the immediate response to that was to go on doing an endless Goals Assessment. Just keep asking for more goals and then more goals and you who were here, you know how that was. It was . . . it was pretty grim. What was this?

But I was operating on a datum that you don’t know about. And that is that people have been assessed . . . some very rare cases have been assessed to Clear without finding the goal. They must have been by former auditing, you see, just within about three or four centimeters of the top. And then you did an assessment and they cognited on these things and blew forth to Clear. It has happened. Well, in view of the fact that it happened, I thought this other could possibly happen, too, then. But it didn’t and it doesn’t. And a quick recapitulation on the whole thing showed that the goals were always within the 150 and that was it. So the upshot of this is that it’s just Assessment by Elimination.

Now, the person is going to rephrase goals and is going to think of different goals. Of course, you have to put those things down. But it’s mostly when the pc volunteers them that you put those down. You’re not beating him to death trying to find vast new numbers of goals. And you’ll find that you’ve got the pc’s goal. And that . . . that’s it, because it all eliminated and only that goal is falling

Now, the speed with which you can do this is totally dependent on your skill, not the pc’s difficulty. See, you’ve got a big altitude factor, you’ll at once pull this pc’s goal up and there it’ll be, you see? But if the pc’s feeling a little bit queasy about goals and is getting ARC broke and other things are going off and the rudiments go out, all of a sudden goal ceases to react.

Evidently, it’s a very delicate thing. Evidently, the rudiments out can suppress the goal. And in the absence of very much altitude, this happens easily

You got the pc’s goal. The pc gave you the goal, but it disappears off the meter. So do the other goals disappear off the meter. Everything disappears off the meter. Why do they disappear off the meter? Well, because the rudiments are out. That is all.

Rudiments are out; of course, altitude has gone to hell and pc isn't in-session or anything else.

So the proper way to do a goals list . . the best way I know of to do a goals list at this time, is to ask the pc to come to session with a list of all of the goals they have ever had. And then sit down, take the various categories of goals, like secret goals, withheld goals, any other kind of category of goals that you can think of and ask him for a few of those. And you ask him for a few more of those and in the next category and get a few of those. And run it down so you're not getting wild needle reactions on the thing. You'll wind up with a goals list there that will be maybe . . maybe as much as 150, maybe as little as 60 or 80. And then having gotten this, why, you . . well, I just start in doing an Assessment by Elimination.

Probably the best thing you ought to do in view of the difficulties we've had on it, is to check the rudiments. Now that you've got the goals list, check the rudiments and start in from the beginning. And just mark the goals that react as you pass them by. And some of those goals will be quite null.

Now, there are two ways you can do it and both of them are quite valid. One, you can repeater technique them . . repeat the goal 2, 3 times. If it's still in, leave it; and if it's gone now, scratch it. And the other one, is just go over the list. Just read the list, one goal after the other goal. And those that are still in, mark them as still in. The next time you read the list, those that are out, you omit. If they all disappear, consider that the whole list has been muffed and get the rudiments very thoroughly in and go back over the whole list again just as though you've never assessed. Now, that would give you the pc's goal. See, I don't think you could miss.

Now, once you've got the pc's goal . . once you've got the pc's goal . . you want to be very sure that that is it. And the way to be very sure is to get somebody else to check it.

Now, the way to check a goal is to take this goal against some of the others that were reacting last . . you know, some that were still in, the last ones that disappeared, something like that . . and read it over in comparison with the ones that were still in. you know, go by it casually as though it's just one of these other goals, see, not give it undue emphasis. And you may be reading 5, 6, 8, 10 goals there, you see? And you just go over this list, read them down, see if any of these other goals now react. And then find out if that goal is consistently reacting.

First thing you want to do when you're checking is to check the rudiments. And then if the rudiments are out, get the pc to go back and get the rudiments put in. And then check the goal. Don't check goals with rudiments out. And you'll find that the goal, if that is the pc's goal, will react very nicely and very neatly and that's all there is to it.

Now, pcs often get very sure that such and so is their goal and if I catch any student off of this course . . I don't care, you can do it maybe off of a course in lower south Ambria or something. Don't for God's sakes, Q-and-A with this. Don't . . don't Q-and-A with a pc, please. If you learn one thing here, please learn: Don't Q-and-A with the pc.

The pc says, "Well, I just know that's my goal. I just know it is. I just know it is. I just know it is."

Look, that had nothing to do with the price of fish. The E-Meter knows. Maybe it's their goal and maybe it hasn't . . isn't their goal.

I've had pcs going around this very place saying, "Well, that's my goal: to blow up the First National Bank and that's it. We know that. yes sir, that's my goal. There is no doubt about that," you see. And that's out tomorrow. That disappears. And their goal is something else. But they can get hung up on one of these goals. But this doesn't mean that because they get hung up on one and keep on telling you that that is the goal, that it isn't the goal. you see, the goal they're telling you about may be the goal and it may not be the goal. That's beside the point. Works same way with terminals. It may be the terminal, it may not be the terminal. What the pc is telling you had nothing to do about it.

When you check it out, you know. What the pc says has nothing to do with it. That's all. you just never take what the pc says. That's all, man. you just don't do it! Because you're going to make some serious damned blunder that's going to wind up somebody in one awful mess. I'm not kidding.

You take the wrong goal just because the pc said it was that: well, you're playing an awful overt on that pc. And you take the wrong terminal just because the pc was absolutely sure that it was a bank president . that was the terminal, yeah.

"Who would rob the bank?"

"The bank president."

All right. That's it! Because that's the most logical one. Of course, that's it. And so forth. Well, you buy that just because the pc says so?

You run that on the Prehav Scale and the next thing you know, you have more levels live. And you run it on another level and you've got more levels lye. And you're just making the whole scale go live. And what you're doing is bringing into play every bit of the Step Six phenomena. Step Six phenomena only took place when you were operating with the wrong terminal. Whole bank beefs up. The whole bank goes live if you start running the wrong terminal. So it's a very dangerous thing to do. And it's not a mild thing to do at all. And one of the easiest ways to fall from grace on this is to take what the pc says is his terminal regardless of what the E-Meter says.

The E-Meter knows. If it doesn't check out on the E-Meter, it isn't it. And if it . . if it fails to check out on the E-Meter, it may still be it but it means just the rudiments are out. Get the rudiments in; it'll react.

Now, you assess a terminal exactly the same way and there's tricky ways of assessing terminals. You can ask for both the cause and effect end of the goal, now, under the heading of terminals . . cause and effect end of the goal.

I'm not scolding you, but actually my temper has been sorely tried in the last few months on this subject. It's looking for this . . not a white pebble; it's this white mountain in the middle of a black desert, you see.

It's very simple. You just take any goal and it usually has a cause and effect. You consider the goal cause-distance-effect, like a communication line, don't you see? And there's something that does it to something in almost every goal.

In other words, "I," you see, "want to rob the First National Bank." All right. There's "I" who wants to do the robbing and there's the terminal to be robbed. See? There's two things there. So you can get two lists and it'll appear on either end. But don't worry about that too much. And if you find it too difficult to reinterpret, just do the simple list.

You just say, "Well, who would rob the First National Bank?" or "What would rob the First National Bank?" You see? And something on that order. There is no point, however, in a . . in avoiding this. But you . . I'm only . . reason I'm putting this reservation in there is because I imagine there can be goals that it'd just try your wits trying to find out which is the cause and which is the effect end of the thing. Like, "to be myself" Well, who is trying to be what? And you've opened up the whole field and you're nowhere. Of course, this is just a nowhere goal. It's quite usual. It's quite an ordinary goal for a pc to wind up with: "To be myself"

Great. "Who are you?" Now you've got a tough terminals run, man. It's a tough terminals run. You've got not a clue. Nobody's got a clue. "What is the terminal?"

"Myself"

"Who are you?" That's the obvious thing you have to ask. "Well, I . . ." "Who . . who are you?"

"Who is trying to be who?" is the double one, see? "Who are you trying to be who?" See? It's quite amazing that you can do a Terminals Assessment on it at all. yet it's a very common goal. All right.

Now, you mustn't omit . . you mustn't omit . . things as terminals. Because to a pc here and there, you're going to find a spacecraft is more real than a spaceman. And although we have always so far broken the what over to a who . . you know, found spacecraft and it wound up to be a spaceman . . I imagine from just that indicator that sooner or later there's going to be a what that doesn't break down to a who. It's going to be the First National Bank and that is it. It isn't any who robbing anything, it's the First National Bank, see. That's it. That's the goal . . terminal. It's a what. We've found enough of them.

Well, here's a common sort of occurrence on the track. Fellow is riding around, minding his own business in a spaceship . . only blowing up planets and doing other minor things . . and hardly troubling anybody, you see, hardly at all. And terrific numbers of overts, you see? And he smashes up a spacecraft 1, spacecraft 2, spacecraft 3, spacecraft 4, spacecraft 5, then starts putting spacecraft 6 in danger, sort of impulsively and it starts getting chipped up. And the next thing you know, this fellow will not assess as a who. This fellow will assess as a spacecraft. Good enough. If you can't make it come out to a who, well it's obviously . . that's it.

What's he done? He's sort of splattered all over a spacecraft and is being one.

Now, when you realize that a body is a vehicle this is not as odd as it might look. A body is a vehicle. Thetan carrier.

Now, you've got to use some sense in making a Terminals Assessment. But like, in doing an assessment on goals, you don't prompt. You don't prompt. Just lay off prompting. The safest thing to do is to just leave it alone. That's the safest thing to do. If the pc doesn't say it, it isn't said. you understand? Because you can feed him something weird and get a reaction on it and it isn't quite right and then you have a lot of trouble, then you get an ARC break. And I think most of the ARC breaks on goals is prompting. See, I think that would be the most fruitful source of them. So although I have prompted successfully, it doesn't mean that it always works. He says, "Well, I don't know. To be a denizen of the frozen north. Yes, that's the goal." "That's the goal you're operating on . . to be a denizen of the frozen north." All right.

And you say, "All right. Well, give me a terminal for that." It's always a very safe question.

"Uh . . I can't think of any."

And you say, "Well, who would be a denizen of the frozen north?"

"Well, I can't think of any."

"Uh . . well, who would occupy the place?"

"Well, can't think of anybody at all."

Oh, what a temptation at this moment, you know, to say . . because you know you've got it on your own branch line of terminals . . goals terminals, you know . . say, "The Royal Northwest Mounted Policeman?"

Well, of course, the pc has to reject this. Pc has to reject this and to that degree rejects you as the auditor. And every time you give a pc a suggestion of that character and he has to reject it, why, you . . he's thrown you . . had to throw you out of session. In other words, he had to go on auto, you see, to some slight, tiny degree. And this may be . . the source of these ARC breaks may be straight out of the area of prompting. I almost never prompt.

But I've had four or five auditors sitting behind me while I was doing a Goals Assessment on somebody, passing me notes. "It's his wife," you know. "It's his . . it's his wife." This isn't distractive at all to the pc, you see. "It's his wife." They don't realize that it's just because I'm trying to hold the pc in-session that I don't turn around to them and say very impolitely, "Why don't you shut up! If it's his wife, it's his wife. And if it isn't his wife, it isn't his wife. And that is all there is to it!"

Now, the auditor's phrasing . . . the auditor's phrasing of the goal won't run, much less assess. It won't run. It's got to be the pc's phrasing of the goal. So you start feeding him leads . . . oh, wow! See, you've just opened up the doors to all sorts of errors. He's got to reject the auditor. He can't rephrase it himself, you see. So just knock off the prompting and you will be a very much happier auditor. You know what's wrong with the pc. The pc is always looking like this, you know? Always looking like this. And he says, "Mmmmmmmmm. Mmmmmmm. Mmmm. "You know, he always does. you say, "He must be a robot." It's very obvious he's a robot. Very, very, very obvious.

And he sits there and he can't think of another terminal and he doesn't know what would be in a factory, see? He just hasn't any idea, you know, what would be in a factory.

"Factory, factory. Nobody in factories. Factories are always empty."

You know and he goes, "Mmmmm, hmmm."

You say, "God Almighty, why didn't he fall wise to this thing?" And a terrible temptation, you know, to say "Could it be a robot? Could it be a robot? Could it be? Could it be?" Well, he gets all wound up. He's got to reject you. Got to reject you by rejecting the suggestion, don't you see? And he's got to look at it. Now, he's got to get his own thought channel straightened out and back again. He doesn't quite know what he's doing And you can waste a half an hour session time, just like that . . . bang. That is the least that will happen with prompting.

Turns out it wasn't that at all. The terminal is a derrick. He'll finally fall wise to it.

Now, in view of the fact that the terminal has got a lot of not-knowingness connected with it, don't expect them to come up with rapidity. Expect a lot of comm lags. Expect a lot of comm lags on something of that sort.

Now, wherever you have a pc in session on a Goals and Terminal Assessment, your temptation, because it is apparently a very loose action . . . not a very tight auditing situation, don't you see; he isn't running anything and so on . . . your tendency is to be loose in your auditing. You let down your barriers. And when you let down your barriers, your altitude goes right along with it. You've got to be more careful during a Goals and Terminal Assessment of proper adherence to a professional appearance than in any other auditing situation.

It's obvious that auditors haven't done this because they've taken forever to get terminals and goals. So casualness or lack of discipline in carrying out the routine must itself be very poor.

Now, there is no routine designed that does solely a Goals Assessment. I thought of designing one time . . . and I said, "Oh God, that's too" something or other . . . a special Model Session, you see, for a Goals Assessment. I thought afterwards, "Oh, that's going too far, man. Another Model Session?" and that sort of thing. You don't have to have one. But you certainly have to keep up a professional demeanor and you have to be very crisp and you mustn't let it down and you must carry it forward competently or the goal will disappear. And later on when you get the terminal, it'll disappear. Anything is liable to happen in this line.

So, you take your E-Meter and you put the pc on it. And you read things off in a very businesslike fashion. You acknowledge every time, whether the pc speaks or not. It is not necessary to have the pc say one single word while you're reading a Goals or Terminals list back to them, but always acknowledge as though the pc has spoken. Always acknowledge. You say, "To rob the First National Bank," he says absolutely nothing. You say, "Thank you."

Sounds kind of odd to you, but you'll find the pc gets hung up. He's kind of answered it, don't you know? He kind of, you know . . . he's thought it. Now, that's enough.

Now, for a pc to be required to speak or answer up, or say very much while you're reading a list like this, is quite distractive. And you think the pc may not be in-session. So you may be trying much too eagerly

to get the pc to look like a pc while you're reading this list. And it's not necessary at all. All he does is sit there on total irresponsibility, holding the cans. That's enough.

All I expect of a pc is the goals list and the terminals list and to sit there in some kind of a . . . of a state of attention, no matter how slight. That's all I expect of a pc in doing a Goals and Terminal Assessment. You know? He isn't supposed to say, "Oh well, yes. Oh, rob First National Bank? Well, yeah. Why, you just read that goal. I see. Rob the First National Bank. Let's see, I'll think about robbing the First National Bank for a moment. That's fine." Oh, bunk! You don't want to have anything to do with that. See?

So you tell a pc before you start reading the list, "You do not have to speak. You do not have to say anything if you don't want to. It is only necessary that you sit there and listen to me read this list. That is the only thing I actually expect you to do and if you want to say something, why, by all means, do so."

And you just say that to the pc before you start any kind of a list. And you'll find out you'll just make hay left and right, you know. Ram, wham, wham, wham, wham, wham, right on down the line. All right.

Now, on reading a goals or terminals list, you of course read only instant read. you do not read latent read. If the read takes place more than tenths of a second after you've read the goal or terminal, it is a latent read. It must read now. And you'll find the further the terminal is off the line . . . the farther the goal is off the line, the further the terminal is off the line . . . if you could time the meter reaction with a microsecond meter alongside of it, you would find there's a direct relationship to how far the goal is off the line to the length of time it takes the E-Meter to respond. Unfortunately, it's measured in microseconds.

The further it is, the slower the read. Until this gets over to total idiocy. You see, it's dropping fifteen or twenty seconds after you've read the goal. Why, that has nothing to do with it. Nothing to do with it . . . pay any attention to it. It isn't even a read. It's an afterthought. Remember that the goal and the terminal are the sum and substance of the reactive mind. And if anything is going to instant read on a meter, it's the goal and the terminal. They're going to read right now. Instantly! So you ignore latent reads.

Well, now to be on the safe side, what do we mean by a latent read? It's any read that takes place from one-half to one second after the question is stated. Anything that takes place one-half to one second after the end of the question or the end of the terminal reading is a latent read.

An instant read is anything that takes place up to a half a second. That is just to make very sure that you don't miscalculate it because you can be speaking to somebody who has difficulty with English and you've got a little comm lag. The comm lag won't be much, though. That will just be that little split-second comm lag. You're reading . . . you're doing the Goals Assessment on somebody from Germany. And you're doing it in English and their native tongue is German and they're having difficulty with English and haven't spoken it for a year or two, or something like this. And you'll find out there's just a little wheel turn. But you'll find out this will occur on everything so that you can quickly measure it up. And it's no more than a half a second, let me assure you. So that would be for a very special case.

And the more it is close to the goal and the more it is close to the terminal, the faster the read is going to occur. And as I say, if you had a microsecond meter you could probably establish a Goals Assessment instantly and immediately by a second meter that is sitting alongside of this meter, you know, plugged into it. There was no current there after your voice impulse. It would be a very complicated meter, which is why I don't advocate building one. It would have to take voice impulse and measure the length of time from the voice impulse to the meter's impulse. In other words, it'd be slightly connected to the auditor, in that his voice would actuate it. And when his voice ceases, it would have to instantly measure the length of time from his voice ceasing to the . . . a current going through the E-Meter. I'm merely stating this just as a . . . as an indicator. You'll see this as you get more experience on the thing that it's fast. It's real fast.

And when you've got the person's goal, you say, "bank pres . . ." you got a read. See, you don't even get a chance to say "bank president."

"Bank pres " read.

And it's a cashier, is the next terminal on the thing. And you say, "cashier" . . . read. See, cashier isn't it. you could establish that, actually, with due attention to the E-Meter but nobody is asking you to do that and that is not a part of the routine or regimen. It's just a little indicator that you can . . . some nonsense that you can pay some attention to. It's not even very valuable nonsense at the moment. All right.

The characteristic of the reactive mind is that it hasn't a concept of time. That is the first thing that goes out in an engram, is the concept of time, so that the engram becomes all time. So of course, that thing which reads with the least time is the most reactive. That is the total rationale. All right.

Now, if you've gone all the way through a terminals list and you suspect there may be some more terminals, why, by all means get some more terminals onto the list. But this itself can be a defeated activity. When you start getting up to a hundred or two terminals, this just starts getting to be nonsense. Somebody has missed. I'd go back and I would take the whole group that I had gotten, before I noticed the pc was having trouble giving them to me . . . I'd take the earlier group . . . and then I would cover that one with the rudiments in. I would get the rudiments thoroughly in and then I would go over it. And I would pick the terminal out of it.

Now, a person's terminal will only bury if the rudiments on the sessions in which it was found were out. That's the only thing that will bury it. you clean up the sessions, it'll reappear. And therefore, you're interested in getting the thing checked, basically to find out if it still reads elsewhere.

Now, in doing Goals and Terminals Assessments, you can run into odd bugs. you can run in to some interesting, odd propositions where the present time problem of the pc, which he doesn't actually realize, is getting in the road of his Goals Assessment. And his Goals Assessment is not his present time problem, or something is crisscrossed up like this.

Well, it to some degree has something to do with his rudiments being out. But that goal which has to do with his present time problem will read sporadically. It will read very sporadically. It'll be in and it'll be out and it'll be in and it'll be out and then it'll be out and it'll be out and it'll be out. And then all of a sudden it's in again and so on.

It's not any instant read connected with the thing. A thing just lurking. So you can suspect that there might have been something wrong with the auditing room or might have been something wrong with the auditor. Or there might have been something wrong with the session's present time. That's the first thing you ought to suspect on something like that.

And as I say, we had the example of somebody being assessed up on the second . . . British second floor and what do we find? We find the person's fear of height was getting this and I'm . . . I was told afterwards, after I mentioned this last time, that being audited in the basement had something to do with kicking in dungeons or something of the sort, see? So that wasn't so good either. We still got the person's goal, so it's all right.

But a present time problem of the auditing environ . . . it wasn't a present time problem in life, having to do with life or livingness; it was just having to do with the auditing environ . . . was kicking in and raising the devil with the Goals Assessment. Well actually, that should have been discovered on the question, "Is it all right to audit in this room?" So it goes right straight back

to rudiments out. See, a rudiment was out and the rudiment that was there . . . "Is it all right to audit in this room?" . . . and that should have been caught.

And all that difficulty would have been avoided, don't you see? And you wouldn't have had any questions at all on the thing. All right. To recapitulate: to do an assessment, it is best to tell the pc to go off someplace and sit down and . . . you know, tonight or something . . . and do a full list of goals. And you can also give him withheld goals and secret goals or anything else you want to give him on the list. And say, "Give me goals for all of these subjects," and so forth.

And he'll come back with a large sheaf of paper and he sometimes has a hundred goals on it. And then you yourself look at the meter and ask if he's got any more on this subject, that subject or the next subject, you see? And you've made sure that he doesn't have any ARC breaks on this, and you just drain down the needle reaction. And you get a few more that he might not have mentioned or might have been too reticent to tell somebody about, or something like this. And then that's about it. Just consider, well, you've got the list. All right. That's fine.

Now, your reading of that list can be done by repeater technique, going over and over and over, which is the common, most accepted way of doing it but which can wind up some pcs in difficulty. Or just reading the list over and over and every time you get an instant reaction from a goal you mark that it's still in. And you no longer get an instant reaction on another goal and you consider it's out. And you just scratch goals and check goals and scratch goals and check goals. And that's all you do.

Then you finally have got it down to the end of the thing. You find out you've got two or three reacting and maybe that was the end of that session or something of the sort. And catch it the next time and go over that. And then maybe go over the whole list again before you get real sure. Find out if they're all null, you know? Then you got it down to one goal and there's one goal that just is consistently reacting and it reacts very nicely and very consistently and that's it. Well, get somebody else to check it.

Now, if that goal has not appeared, the first thing that you must assume is that the rudiments were out in that session. So you laboriously put the rudiments in now. you put them in with a thud! Don't try to do a full Security Check when you get to withholds, but let's find out if there were any withholds while that Goals Assessment was going on. And let's find out if there are any withholds from you particularly . . you know, that kind of thing.

And get this thing in, get it back real good and then do a Goals Assessment from scratch. Well, this is less difficult than you'd think. Much less difficult than you'd think because most of them will be out now anyhow. And he'll only be left with a handful of goals and you'll come right on back and you will find the person's goal again.

Well, what if this happened again? Well, by this time, get the rudiments in! And do it all over again. And set the case up. And just keep doing that, not getting more and more goals and going on and on and on and on and on with the compounding errors. You got it?

All right. Now, same way with a terminal. Same way with a terminal.

You've got the person's goal? You're going to do a terminals list. I actually don't care what wording you use to do the terminals list. There's a cause end of the terminals line, an effect end of the terminals line. There . . . apparently there are two lists. But you can get far too mechanical for this. And you could say, "Well, who wanted to be a baseball player?"

Fellow says, "I did."

Well, that's not informative. Because you certainly can't run "I" as a terminal.

And all right, you . . . it's an oddity for you to say, "Well, what's . . . what would . . . so you call a baseball player?" or "What . . . who would play baseball?" or something like this. And you get some more of these and some more of these and some more of these. And the reason you do that is because the pc's statement, "baseball player," might be just a hair out. It may be "a pitcher," you see. It may be "a batsman." It might be something else, see. It's just enough out that it won't quite run. And you get that thing straightened out and you usually got it.

But a goal of this particular character . . . now I'm taking somebody else's goal in vain, but I'm sure that she won't mind . . . a goal of this character: "To have a particular kind of body." Well, that leaves the doors wide open, don't you see? What's a particular kind of body? And you get a description of this body. "What would you call such a body?" you see? "Who would have such a body?" "What kind of a body is it?" See, that gives you two lists, you know? "Who would have it?" and "What is it?" And you get that list and shake that list down and get that all straight and you've got it made.



And that's the proper way to do one of these things. When you've got that taped, it will make a considerable difference in your pc.

And your final tests, of the thing, are these: Did it make much difference to your pc that you found that terminal? Does it make any difference to the pc? Well, if it didn't make much difference to the pc, there might be some question on it. Not enough question on it, however, but to cause you to do the final test. And the final test is such an elementary test that it is hardly even worth describing.

You assess the pc on the Prehav Scale. And assessing the preclear on the Prehav Scale, you find a level for that terminal. All right.

You run that level until the tone arm motion slows down; you're not getting very much tone arm motion left. Sometimes you have to run the level for a while to get some tone arm motion to appear. But let us say the tone arm motion has appeared and disappeared off the tone arm and you do a reassessment. Well, the first time you assess, there were only 4 levels live of the Prehav Scale when you did it. And this time you do an assessment and you have 12 levels live on the Prehav Scale. You'd better drop that just like a hot potato because that is a wrong terminal! And if you persist in running it any further than that, the pc is going to go into the soup.

So what do you do at this time? You get the rudiments in and you do a Goals Assessment using the original list. And you find the pc's goal. And you're much horrified because it's the same goal, probably. And then you get the Terminals Assessment on the thing and you will find that that was wrong.

Now, it can only be wrong if you did it wrong. But something slipped. It's the wrong terminal. And that is a positive proof

If you want to get a good auditor reality on this sometime, pick a terminal at random on a pc. you know, you pick a terminal. You know? You make up your mind now that this person looks like a robot. So you say, "That's fine. Now, we're going to run a robot on the Prehav Scale. All right. Now we're going to do an assessment on a robot. "Would a robot be serene?" and here we go, see . . . whichever way you assessed it. "Would a robot have faith?" And I imagine as some Academy student is doing probably this very instant, is asking somebody, "Would a robot have TR 10?" Go up the list very nicely, do a proper assessment; you will find that the robot will assess by elimination. Yes, the robot does have a level. That's fine. Now we're going to run this level.

Note carefully, however, how many levels a robot was alive on the Prehav Scale. Note that carefully and mark it down, an arithmetical number. There were 5 levels live on the Prehav Scale when we assessed a robot. There are the pencil dots that say which levels were alive. There were 5.

Now we're going to run it. And we give it a 2Y2-hour enthusiastic run with all the rudiments in and everything going along just perfect, you see, and the auditing command perfect . . . five-leg bracket; everything is fine.

Now reassess it on the Prehav Scale. You're going to find about 10 levels live. Well, good. They will assess too. So you assess those things down to just got 1 level left. Now we're going to take this one level and we make a perfect command. We get the rudiments in (if we can). And we're going to take this one level and we're going to run it on the preclear.

Robot. Good. And we're going to run it for 2Y2, 3, 4 hours. Oh, the preclear will be getting gains. Pc will be feeling much better. Odd somatics, but very much better. Not quite sure, but probably all right. (Confidence in the auditor, you see.)

And now flatten that second one. And now you got 5 and 10 written up there in the corner . . . do another assessment on the pc on the Prehav Scale and you're going to find anything. You're not going to find 5. You're not going to find 10. You'll be finding 15 or 20 levels live. Actually, works out. Works out every time. It's just a mysterious little slide . . . empirical fact that moved in sideways on us. Your arbitrary terminal is not the pc's terminal.

Well, you haven't heard me saying too much lately about auditing Prehav 13. A little of it goes an awfully long ways. Why? Because you're running arbitrary terminals. Oh yes, they're assessed terminals to some degree. Oh yes, well, you can't get into too much trouble with it. But let's really make a good, hot, fast run. We decide the trouble with this married couple is each other. And we take the husband and we're going to run him on the wife.

And we assess the wife on the Prehav Scale and instead of giving it a light run on the needle as I was advising earlier, we give it a tone arm run, with full tone arm tests for flatness, you see, and everything and so on. It hasn't anything to do whatsoever with his terminal line. you see, it's way off His terminal line is a ditch digger and you're running a wife, see. Great day in the morning.

He's going to get worse and worse. He'll get worse and worse toward his wife, too. This situation won't resolve at all. Why? You are running another terminal than the pc is in. And he's not on that terminal line and because you ran it, you of course are creating the Step Six phenomenon. You are beefing up the whole bank.

Now, you can do it for a little while and get away with it. But it's almost too close a borderline for you to do it at all. It's something you can do and something you can get away with, but isn't something I would advise you to do. Because it's . . . several tests on it . . . very recent tests . . . have been confirming the fact. And it seems to be quite invariable that if you run the wrong terminal the whole scale goes live. And of course, then, this would apply to specialized terminals of any kind, which weren't the preclear's terminals.

Now, if you run a level flat on the Prehav Scale and you reassess, the Prehav Scale . . . current, that you're using; not the rewritten scale which you will have very shortly. The one with just 65 levels is the one I'm speaking of. There's another one that is slightly longer, that's all. There are just a few little additives and changes on it. Modernized it. But there are several harmonics on that 65-number scale. And of course you will usually get 4 or 5 levels when you assess. You get 4 or 5 levels falling and then they separate out and they fall down to one. All right. That's normal. But if you're running the right terminal, the next time you do the assessment, you'll get four or five levels and they assess down to one. And the next time you assess the terminal, you get 2 or 3 levels and they assess down to one. The next time you do it, you get 4 or 5 and they assess down to one, you see?

It's never increasing. You don't get more and more levels the more assessments you do on successive runs. And if you're running the right terminal . . . the right terminal will only drop on a few levels and the next time you assess, it won't have increased. There won't be any more levels than that.

So that is a good way to know whether or not you're running the right level. That is always the first question I ask after there has been a Prehav run on somebody's terminal. How many levels went alive, see? Because if an additional number of levels went alive over and beyond the first assessment, we know he has the wrong terminal. So that confirms and proves up at once the goal and terminal of the pc. So there is a way to prove it up. Well, that's a good thing to know, isn't it? You're not swimming in the dark there at all.

Now, somewhere along the line, if the sessions are very bad, if rudiments have been consistently out, the pc stops making progress on general runs. Once more, the invalidation of the goal, the invalidation of the terminal, still hold true during the run. It wasn't true that they just disappeared during the assessment. It is also true that they can disappear during a run by reason of out-rudiments.

So goals runs which are undertaken with out-rudiments tend to suppress the goal and terminal of the pc. And you get up to a point of where you can't get the goal to register and you can't get the terminal to register and you can't find a level on the Prehav Scale and you don't know what the hell is going on. And you say, "Well, the pc must be flat on that." Before you declare it flat, knock the rudiments to pieces. Go back and get those rudiments in and try to get them in for every session he's been run on too, you see?

Just ask him . . . well, actually, the ARC break process, using the word auditor will take care of the background of it, you see.

“What were you willing to be? What are you unwilling to be?” will take care of the pc, that is, the willingness to be audited . . . takes care of that point.

ARC break was the one I meant first; takes care of the ARC break with the auditor. “What were you able to tell?” and “What shouldn’t the auditor have done?” or “What didn’t he do?” This for all sessions, see.

So these rudiments which you have now and which just came out on an HCOB today should be put in. And then the whole picture should be examined again. And check him again for his goal and check him for a terminal and so on. And if they’re gone now, now well, that’s dandy. You’ve got to do a brand-new Goals Assessment and a brand-new Terminals Assessment, because you’ve actually closed out one goal, one terminal.

Now, the way you do this second run, when you think you have that terminal flat . . . the way you do that second run . . . is of less interest right now than it was. But you of course always first check for an additional terminal for the same goal before you go assuming the goal is dead . . . totally. You may find there’s a second terminal on the thing And if you don’t find one, why, dandy.

Now you will get to the successive situation whereby the person does give you goals and does give you terminals and this is what starts looking now by . . . the actual, reliable, endless assessment takes place now. Well, you’ve got a terminal flat and a goal flat and now endless assessment can be expected. Any time now.

You may find another goal. you may find another terminal on the second time. That’s quite probable. And you may get it over on the Prehav Scale . . . your terminal over on the Prehav Scale . . . and get it assessed there. And you may get it run. And it may take a while to run it. Not necessarily; it just may. But when you’ve got that one gone, it is much less likely now that this same cycle will repeat. But you’re going to have to try to find a goal . . . just as I have told you and just as you did originally . . . you’re going to have to find a terminal and you’re going to have to try to get it over onto the Prehav Scale before it evaporates, going to have to try to get it run before it evaporates and then it’s gone and there’s nothing you can do about that. So, you’ve got to do another Goals Assessment and you apparently now are in the stage of endless Goals Assessments. You get into that stage right about then. And you just, “Any more goals? Any more goals? Any more goals? Any more goals?”

And the fellow finally says, “Well, yeah. Yeah. There’s . . . yeah. Oh yes! I had a goal one time. It was back in Arslucus and that was to bash the foreman in the head.”

“All right.” And you check it and it stays in and you say, “All right. Now, let’s find a terminal for it.”

“Foreman.” You didn’t make it. Disappeared.

Looks like an endless Goals Assessment, don’t you see? What’s happening is, the fellow is doing erasure and clearing by Goals and Terminals Assessment. But that occurs normally with most cases only after a tremendous amount of work has been put in on the original goal.

Now, of course, you’ve speeded this up and accelerated it when we get into the running of engrams. You run the goal for a while, a lot of pictures have come up, the pc has avoided these pictures (and they all will); you’ve got to get in and run some engrams. And you get these engrams cleared up. Now you’ve probably accelerated and brought much nearer the idea of the endless Goals Assessment.

And there’s one pc who was almost Clear but couldn’t check out as Clear . . . reacted on certain things that the HCO Sec said. you know, gave him certain questions, reacted on them. And was told that he didn’t make it. And he says, “To hell with this,” and he went home and he wrote three pages of terminals and came back in, checked out Clear. Quite interesting Happened down in Johannesburg In other words, he apparently just had been left with one terminal cycle hung up, possibly on his last goal or something like that and he just went home and wrote the terminals and went Clear. Didn’t even require an auditor. Well, by that time, you can be dispensed with.

But anyway, looking over all of the nuances and oddities of assessment, I don't see how you can make a mistake. If you follow these various directions and if you do a good workmanlike job, I don't see how you can err. I really don't see how you can err. And I don't expect you to manage it. Okay?

Thank you.