ASPECTS OF 3D

A lecture given on
5 December 1961

Thank you.

You'll be happy to know the heat will be on tomorrow afternoon. You'd be surprised how many hats I wear. It's absolutely uncountable and from every viewpoint each one looks like a full hat to the people who have that particular line, you see. They say, "Well, he does nothing else but this and that's all right."

All right. Today we're going to tell you about 3D. And this is the 5th of December. This is the nautical month, 5 Dec. 1961.

It is the nautical month, too. I missed out on buying a boat. I only had two and you can't hardly get along with two boats, you know. And by George, I got a call at two o'clock today, and we had traced the Royal Navy's sale of a 1958 built motor torpedo boat that I was trying to get, to a scrap merchant. And he let me have it for the price of scrap plus 10 percent. It's a £156,000 vessel and I bought it for £3,000. So that's why it's 5 Dec.

Actually, you know, people get upset when I get interested in other things. But, frankly, that's not much of an interest in other things. It hasn't anything to do with my goals-terminal line, by the way. What I've been trying to do is get a couple of vessels and put them into some kind of condition, but get a third vessel that I could fix up and sell for enough money to let me have those first two boats for nothing and let me have a proper school here at Saint Hill built up on the line.

And I've been trying to pull off this trick and it—and I was really kind of in the dumps on this because, you see, it kind of all gone skid, when the scrap merchant overbid me in the Royal Navy, you see. So this makes a bit of a difference to you, too. It's basically a financial action.

And in an atomic war, I think we ought to have a little transportation around someplace. It might be a good idea. So that's what this is all about. I'm trying to build a school. Now, all I've got to do is get through the architect, get through the town planning, get through the this and get through the that and that sort of thing

So you're in the position of being able, some day, to look back to those "good old days" before Saint Hill was such a set proposition. This is . . . What we're doing right now is the direct ringer of 42 Aberdeen Road, 1950. Exactly the same. Old 42 Aberdeen Road was just a private house and there were people stuffed in, in all quarters and coming out all the windows. That's the way it was and it's a funny thing that started a long haul and this Saint Hill proposition, which is about the same view, starts the thing out all over again, complete with furnaces that go out and British weather that blows.

All right. Regardless of all that, our concern here is with 3D.

Now, I'm going to start out with an idea that you haven't got a clue what you're doing with 3D. Of course, that is wrong. Now, I have known of the existence, not by name or by composition, of the Goals Problem Mass for many, many years. Around 53, 54, you find the first mentions of black masses in the bank and that comes out with Black and White Processing and you can do some things to these masses with that and so on.

Now, as the years went on, it didn't seem to me that everybody had these things. And you dropped—there was no concentration on it to amount to anything. Other activities were engaged upon. A high point of result, by the way, was during the days of Concept Processing. And if you're ever in doubt, you want to do some monkey business with some case, you don't have his 3D on, you can always do some Concept Processing of one way or another and probably get away with it.

But that is your best stunt, not to go off into terminals and not to try to handle masses. Because this 3D mass is practically unhandleable by any other route than 3D.

Now, having known of the existence of this mass—. (You wonder why I'm standing up, today; I'm getting into practice for the Washington congress.) The mass factor in a case is often not recognized by the case itself. The case goes in at no lines, no mass, no nothing; a nowhere and as you pull the case up the line—this is the old Reality Scale, I think, of the 17th ACC—you come upstairs to being able to see lines and you actually will have people who will suddenly tell you there were lines going all over the room. There are big, massive tubes of energy that go all over the place and so on. Well, they move up to that, being able to find the terminals that are— and the masses that are on the ends of these lines. That's the next point up on the Reality Scale and they can recognize and see these masses.

Well, we were actually inhibited for some time. Because of the existence of the Reality Scale, I didn't think anybody or—I didn't think everybody would be able to find these masses or collide with them and so therefore I didn't have too much concentration on this particular point.

But now we move into clearing Now, clearing is in two categories. One is a Key-out Clear. You key them out and they clear and they stay that way for—we don't know—they certainly stay that way for some time because I've had people that I had in a—a beautiful state—47, 48, 49, 50—who had never relapsed. I couldn't tell you what their meter responses were because there wasn't such a thing as a meter in 1947, but they were in a very beautiful state.

Their banks were all straightened out. They could see pictures. They had excellent recalls. Why, their worries and troubles had faded away and this was basically getting them to confront things like pictures on a gradient scale and so forth. But a very delicate-type of auditing. It conditions the person to be able to confront, is actually what it does—on a gradient scale and that is your first clearing. And if that is done smoothly and done very well and done very expertly—it takes quite a while—the person keys out.

Now, you must realize that this sort of thing can exist and that this sort of an activity can exist, that you can actually get somebody to confront on gradients, get him to confront, thoroughly, pictures of now and get him to confront this and confront that. But I'm not using the word confront as the process by which it is done. It's not a Confront Process that does this. It is just getting the person nerved up to confronting it all. Because remember, it is the Tone Scale of the thetan which causes him to make that particular setup of pictures.

See, if he's in apathy, he makes apathetic pictures. If he's in punish, he makes punish pictures. If he's in anger he makes angry pictures. If his button is torture, he makes pictures of torture. Do you get the idea? So all you have to do, actually, is change the state of mind of the thetan and he makes a different breed of picture. Quite interesting.

That's, by the way, 1948—the first recognition of this, that something was making all this and something was in agreement with all this. Well, how come we had thetan A and picture B in agreement, see? But I didn't know or wasn't thinking in terms of thetans at that time. I was just thinking of the beingness of the person. I wasn't thinking of it any other than just a very loose way.

This—this question occupied my attention, I remember, for many days back in 1948. I went around in circles looking over this particular aspect of—of the mind. Why was it that this type of picture was made by one person and that type of picture was made by another?

And I had a fairly good recognition at that time that they were making them or at least keying them in. If I remember rightly I was thinking, if all these pictures existed, why are just these—the pictures of this particular type keyed in by this person or pulled in on him? I wasn't thinking of the person creating the pictures. That came later.

But why this particular type of selection? Well, of course, it is the picture that the thetan would make in the state he's in, you see. That's the picture he'd make. He feels apathetic, he makes apathetic pictures. Because he's creating them all, actually, it's a question of doing something with his left hand that his right hand must never find out about. And he makes these pictures, but they're—they're the same tone. In other words, the tone of thetan, the tone of the picture, you see.

And when you change the thetan's tone, why, of course, he makes a different setup of pictures. Well, so early clearing was totally concerned with changing the tone of the thetan. And you have the ne plus ultra in that in processes in old Rising Scale Processing. If you really want to work hard with Rising Scale Processing, you can do some remarkable things with the bank. It's quite remarkable what you can do. It actually was never given its innings. It was never really given a good chance.

But what does that do directly? It gets the thetan to change his mind. Of course, the second he changes his mind, he makes a different kind of picture. So you could actually boost him up scale by getting him to make different kinds of pictures and he'd have a different bank, wouldn't he?

Well, now, you must recognize that as a whole school of thought. That in itself is a whole package of thought which has nothing to do with anything else. A thetan who is—feels mean, makes mean pictures, see? It is the condition of the thetan, you see? It's the condition of the thetan that makes the condition of the picture.

And looking at it in this wise, you get the earliest entrance of Scientology when it first departed from Dianetics and that was we treat the thetan in order to make the picture different. That perhaps was never well articulated, certainly never as well articulated as I've just articulated it, because there's nothing like these six-foot rearview mirrors, you know—six-foot rearview mirror and a little tiny peephole in front.

You're looking through a pinprick forward down the highway, you see, but you've got a six-foot wide mirror that tells you everything to the rear. Those things are marvelous. And it lets all kinds of people say, "I told you so," and "I knew it all the time" and it—so on. Marvelous mechanism.

Anyway, that's a whole package, a whole package. You change the thetan, you change the bank, see? That's a whole philosophy all by itself and you should look at it as such and recognize that it exists. There is that whole picture. There is that whole field of Scientology. It has to do with concepts.

That's why I say use Rising Scale, use concepts. If you want to pull something off with somebody or other and you want a 50/60 percent chance of making it, use Rising Scale Processing; use concepts. You know, it's just hunt and punch sort of stuff and you're going to audit him for three hours and you're not going to do very much about it all; well, it's worth

putting your chips on that particular point on the roulette wheel. Because you've got a pretty good chance of doing something or other spectacular.

If you remember that you're—don't pull in the rest of Scientology, see? Just work with changing the thetan's mind, see? Change the thetan and change his mind. In other words, get him to run concepts, Rising Scale of various kinds or another. Run pluses and minuses—things of that character— and he all of a sudden is liable to come up with something which is quite remarkable. You know, the whole bank shifts.

Now, this in effect, don't you see, keys out all the nasty, dirty, mean pictures he's been making. He stops making them. You see, they're there because he's making them.

All right, so that is a whole field of research and endeavor and that occupied our attention for many, many years. And you might not realize to the extent that that has occupied our attention. Many, many years that has gone on. There's always been a thread of that—get him to change his mind.

You yourselves, you all have heard of this, except some of you. And you get the—you get this whole view. You get the thetan to change—it's attractive, isn't it? It's a—it's a—a lovely—it's a lovely, lovely view. This fellow has banks being stamped all over with elephants and kicked in the teeth by destroyers and planets have rolled together and smashed him flat and he's just fine. And you know, he's standard Homo sap, walking around, falling into the lampposts and doing his job backwards.

We get hold of him and we get him to—we get him, directly, to change his tone. Now, that would be a much more effective state. And we get him to change his tone. And we do that with something like Rising Scale or something like that. And he changes his tone and he stops making pictures of elephants stamping all over him. He starts making other kinds of pictures. You see where this would come from?

Terribly attractive, awfully ineffective. It's too bad. It's too bad. It looks so pretty. And that has been with us since 1948. It is still with us. You can still do it. But, at the time we started clearing, February of 1961—actually, the earlier ACC we had already departed to a marked degree from that lineup with the rock and that sort of thing—but effectively clearing, so that we were clearing very broadly and very—very definitely—there was a fair percentage of cases sent that did arrive at a state of Clear, whether they were there a night or a month or a year, see? There were—there were still some sent which did arrive and that was February of 1961.

All right. Now, that—that is a departure. That's definitely a departure. It's a departure from this other frame of mind. This says the fellow has to be able to go through the bank as he is making it. Just like that and he has to be able to handle the bank he himself is making. And I am sure you will find out on the long run that this brings about stable—a stable state.

Obviously, if the man is capable of making this bank and is afraid of the bank he's going to make, then at some time in the future your change of his tone may reverse as a change of tone and he will again make this bank that he is afraid of. Do you see how this could be?

If you can change his tone by a concepts or by Rising Scale or something, the tone can also shift back the other way, no matter how good he feels. You see that? So that's what you saw when you saw collapsing Clears. When a Clear collapses he changed his tone back.

Now, a Keyed-out Clear who has not handled all those things which are the bank—he's cleared because he's keyed-out; he's usually cleared on the first dynamic—is capable, actually, of doing a double shift and going into an automatic make-up of a bank that he himself knows damn well

he can't handle and because he can relapse—hernia operation? Well, it's stable as long as the guy lives. It's stable for a few years. We don't even know what this word stable means in terms of medicine or psychiatry or psychology or something like that. These fellows never get as bad as they were. They never get as bad as they were. They never go all the way downhill and worsen. But they do lose some of the ground they make.

And we don't want that. We don't want that. We want somebody—we want to be able to pick him up and put him up on a higher plane and then he is now totally cognizant of the kind of bank he was making and what he was doing with it and cognizant of the fact that he can handle it.

Now, that's a different kind of a Clear. I'm not trying to give you a sales talk on this sort of thing This is the head-on collision-type of clearing. And we've been doing some version of it since February of 1961. We said, "All right. There's your bank, there's the goal, there's the terminal. All right. This is what you've been doing obsessively. And instead of changing your tone so you won't do this anymore, we're going to fix you up now so that you don't want to do that anymore. And you can do that if you want to, but you don't have to."

So we found the goal and we found the terminal and then we ran the terminal on the Prehav Scale and that straightened out the various oddities which the fellow was confronting. And in a good representative number of cases—it was, it was a nice percentage—they went Clear. But they were still keying out this other black mass.

In other words, they were just laying it aside. They were sending it off into the far distance and that was fine. Now, their—how Clear they were depended on whether or not that black mass returned. That's how Clear they were and they would be as Clear as long as it didn't.

Well, now, my initial discovery in the matter is simply this: I didn't know that everybody had them. This I didn't know and now I find out they all do. That any Clear cleared by a key-out trim-around-the-edges, send-it-off-into-the-far-distance—whether he ever contacted the Goals Problem Mass or not— still has it and it is something he has not confronted. It is something he has not taken care of, something he is afraid of and something which can key him back in again.

So that puts a stability limiter on clearing. Then the case, of course, would be as stable as it didn't key itself in with a Goals Problem Mass. So you could run—have run the fellow down to a pure floating needle, you would have a Clear. You—you have a Clear. There's no change of definition. This is just it. Clear floating needle and he's fine. His track is wide open. Everything is fine. Life is going along beautifully. He feels wonderful. Everything is just dandy, and so forth. That's it. That's your Clear.

All right. What have you got to do to keep him that way? That's the second question asked and to keep him that way, you have to clear him in a certain peculiar way. You have to drive him, evidently, head on into a brick wall. You have to drive him into whatever it is that is liable to key back on him again.

And we have to front up to the toughest, meanest, roughest part of the bank and go straight through it. Now, I don't mind telling you that this is quite a trick. One, it was quite a trick to find out what it was and it was seven times the trick to find out how to get a case through it.

That has been the trick. Finding out about it—well, anybody can discover something. A fellow can go out here and find a floating island in the middle of the Pacific Ocean and say, there it is. And everybody pats him on the head and so forth. Yeah. Yeah. Well, how about—how about somebody getting an island to float or sink. Or how about somebody getting an island to mote itself across the Pacific or something like that.

That—that's your comparable magnitude, don't you see, of finding it and doing something about it. These are two different things. Doing something about it—this is the rough one. Anybody in the field of the mind or research or philosophy or something like this, has come up to a point about a lightyear from where we have approached it and have said, "Well, ha-ha-ha, something, ha-ha-ha-ha and so on. There must be something. . . We adjudicate, and so on, therefore nothing is... ha-ha. And can't do anything for anybody anyway."

Why? They chickened out. They didn't themselves have enough nerve to confront their own difficulties in this particular line, don't you see? In other words, they started to confront this difficulty in somebody else, confronted it themselves and ran. That's about what it was—all amounted to. I'm not saying this with any plaudits for myself, and so forth. I don't consider it anything to stand around and look and know what you're looking at as being much of a trick. Other people seem to find it so, but I don't.

So, anyway, it amounts to this—it amounts to this: This thing exists; Goals Problem Mass. You'll find it first mentioned under Admiration Processing. And I said, "Well, there are certain avenues of the mind which are better left closed."

Well, that is because nobody knew how to go through them. Nobody knew quite what they were. Now, you can run admiration at one of these—one of these particular masses and you could admire it. You could admire it and you could admire it and you could admire it and you could admire it. And it sort of goes all soupy around the edges, you know? And you could admire it some more, and admire it some more and not admire it some more and then admire it some more and it gets all soggy. It's quite interesting. It's quite interesting.

And it stays right there, soggily. Admiration won't get you through it. But there was an awful lot of that stuff—research on this particular line, late in the year of 1952, here in England. And you'll find it in, possibly, some of the old HASI records.

Don't let anybody run Admiration Processing I think it was out for twenty-four hours before it was recalled. That's long run, long run. I was getting away with it all right and it was working all right for me, but then all of a sudden people started to melt. The mind sort of melted around the edges and a couple of auditors got into severe trouble with it—didn't have enough sense to cut and run or do something about keying it out or something like that.

So it was one of those things that you could do but hardly anybody could handle. That's the difference and that's what causes it. That has been the source, the main source, of our drawbacks or withdrawals of material and that sort of thing, is, yes, it's true—nobody contests the truth of what happened—but can it be handled? And whenever the answer became obvious that the—it was "No, it can't be handled," why, you heard me hurriedly invalidating it and getting it back under cover again and saying skip it.

The final test, of course, is any proce—of any process or process, lies in your hands, not in mine and what I can get away with and what you can get away with may not be very different in order of magnitude, but there is a difference. There is a difference. It has to do with command value on a meter. You'll see that show up and if you're looking for the spook point of how come, try and run levels, sometime, with your rudiments out, on 3D.

Just get your rudiments good and out, have your pc with a nice present time problem, let him have a couple of withholds, preferably an ARC break, then run a level. It's not going to run. I mean, the tone arm just goes up, clank, in one command, something like this. Bang, there it is—stuck, dnth-thuu. Nothing happens. Rudiments are out. It's as important to have the rudiments in.

Well why—why do the rudiments have to be in for you? It's basic command value. You don't have the command value over the pc to run a pc with the rudiments out. That's the difference, see? In other words, getting the rudiments in permits you to have command value over the pc. You should recognize this.

And if you were—you had seventeen times the altitude and fifteen times the umph, you could run the pc with the rudiments out and it wouldn't make a bit of difference to your processing. It's a fact. Rudiments are a question of altitude. But you better not try it, because on 3D I find that it is very difficult to run a case with the rudiments out and I find it far too difficult to do myself. So I don't think you're going to get away with it. My prediction of the future has been based on that.

I don't mean to be cheeky about all this, but I'm just telling you some facts that have come up over the years. So the final test of any process is whether you can do it. That's the final test. And I'm happy to tell you right now that better than 35 percent of this particular class is running very successfully on 3D. So you can do it. So, hence, we better really start lecturing about this thing and pushing it home and showing you everything you can do about it.

It wasn't that it was experimental up to this time. I would have had your—your eyes if you hadn't made it work, because you didn't have any other chance. You got the idea? There's just no other chance. It was a matter of: there is a canyon. Yes, there is a roaring river in the bottom of it. Yes, you have to swing from rock to rock in the most gymnastic imaginable fashion. It has bends and turns and there are sudden spring floods that overtake you and it is the only road out. And I'm sorry, I didn't make the human mind and it just happens that that's the only road out.

I could say, of course and be very scientific... Science in its present state of sacredness, always not-ises itself. "It is the only road out that I have so far found," would be the scientific modification that makes one sound, sound and conservative, you know? It's the nice thing to say, "—that I have found so far. Of course, as we go along the years, we are liable to find another road out, you see, that will be much easier and so forth and we couldn't possibly have found everything there was to find at this state." That's all the implication. You see that's a nice, modest, conservative, scientific statement. So I'm telling you, of course, that it's just the only road out.

All right. Here or there, one or two—having one hell of a time getting into some kind of condition so they can be dragged to the mouth of the gorge. That's about the way it is, see? Just be dragged to the mouth of the gorge, regardless of making it down the gorge. We find that people have limped and gimped to a state where you can't get them up to assessment level without doing an enormous patch-up job. And, of course, it's almost impossible to do the patch-up job because they've got all the other stuff wrong with them, too. Well, perhaps there is the sphere where Concept and Rising Scale may be functional.

You key it out so you can key it in again. You see how you—there might be some roads by which you can get them up there. But in the final analysis the only way they're going to get out of the valley of death is through that particular gorge—through the knothole. It's rough man.

Because at any time in the future, the thetan can go into his basic valence. It is after all his basic answer to everything. So he runs up against an imponderable that he feels incapable to handle, so he immediately takes the ready package. He readjusts his tone to grab hold of the ready-made package which you call 3D. It solves all of his problems for him. It's a solution to living through which you can perish miserably.

Now, there is 3D. I have just shown you—I've—we've known about this black masses and lines and that sort of thing in the reactive mind since 1952, so this is not very new. But I thought for a long time, very hopefully, that all we had to do was change the fellow's tone, he'd cease to make them. And we have keyed them out, we have operated without them, but it has cut our percentiles enormously and it's actually made the auditor's job much harder.

The easy way out is the way out, not to walk around the rim of the canyon fifty thousand times and never leave. See, you can keep walking around the canyon, around the canyon, around the canyon, around the canyon, around the canyon, without ever going out through that gorge, because, you say, "That's too rough!" The second the pc gets near it, all of a sudden his body masses start increasing, to give you some of the liabilities. The winds of space sort of turn on and he all of a sudden—well, actually, little Quentin, the other day, getting assessed on an opposition terminal—it was very funny. You talk about a classic case. He was sitting there in the chair and he was going further and further back, further and further back and he was finally clear back almost out of his chair, getting the opposition terminal. The winds of space, you know, were just blowing his head off. You know. And he kept saying, "Well there's something. It's my eyes. It's the Coke I've been drinking lately." And he had explanations for it all, you know. But it was just that he had the oppterm and he was on the wrong side of this problem, you see and it was blowing his head off. So you will find this is pretty general. I wasn't auditing him, his mother was. And it's pretty wild.

Now, this—this thing exists. These things exist. And you'll become more and more amazed at how this has been an answer to living, how one has used a 3D combo as an answer to living and all of these hidden standards and present time problems and everything else that we've been trying to get rid of are sitting right straight on top of the 3D. There they are. Stacked up. They blow out all the way on up—you start running this. You say, well, there it is, you know. There it is.

Well, I never thought in terms . . . I—I think in terms of the factors of the mind are the factors of the mind, and somebody who wants to go on researching forever could say, "Well, we haven't examined all the two-billion five-hundred million human beings on Earth, so, therefore, we don't know that all of them have a 3D."

Well, the first—first person who says that to me, I will give the assignment of going out and finding out, by getting a 3D on all of the two-billion five-hundred million, so you'd better watch it. That's a pretty good assignment, because they'd have to do it all by themselves. I'll ask the rest of you to lay off till that person gets it done.

Because I haven't yet found anybody who didn't have this combo and remember I have tremendous backlogs of cases. I've been walking into cases of every shape and description and by God, a 3D explains them all.

Somebody's been acting in a weird way and they've had a weird thug . . . Have you—have you ever tried to argue with somebody. You say, "Please, now don't throw your hat down in the sewer because it'll just have to be picked out, you know." Or "Please don't drink that other half bottle of gin." Or "There is no reason, Mother, for you to clean the whole house by Saturday, because there's nothing going to happen on Saturday." And you—you've seen these things and you've explained it all to them and it seemed so reasonable and logical to you and then they threw their hat down the sewer, drank the other half bottle of gin and cleaned the whole house by Saturday. Practically kill themselves, you know? And it just didn't matter.

And eventually you begin to distrust your powers of persuasion and oratory. You say, "There must be something about my persuasion and oratory that is a little bit off, because these people keep throwing their hats down the sewers, drinking the half bottle of gin and so on."

It's very difficult for them to see reason. No, it isn't difficult for them to see reason. They had a different idea in mind than what you had. Only that idea was so fixed—it was an idea fix of such magnitude that when you eventually find it, it almost blows their head off, you know? And if you were to run it wrong way to, it would. You'd just be left there with a bloody stump.

So there it is—3D. You might as well face up to it because there it is. Now, an assessment all by itself, nothing but an assessment on 3D, can be considered an auditing activity with an end goal of simply finding out and assessing. Now, that's the first thing you should know about 3D—that there's considerable benefit just in assessing.

Now, if we were to handle something like this—if you were to say, "Well, we're going to complete a Form 3 Joburg and maybe a Children's Security Check and a Problem's Intensive and get the person's 3D elements and combine them properly." And if you were to call that a whole package of auditing, you would have done more for the case than we've ever before done. You'd find out this was pretty interesting and this stayed fairly stable. This was a—this is an interesting activity to do. People feel a lot better. They're— they're not so much in the mystery of it all.

And they suddenly begin to realize that, "Oh, that is why every time I start thinking about International Harvesters it blows my head off." Yes, well, that's something to know, isn't it?

There is this point, that simply an assessment and naming the elements has value—getting the final story of a 3D. So the 3D breaks down into three stages. One, preparing a person to be assessed. That's stage one. Now that consists of everything that you call Class II auditing skills. Those have value. There's great value in doing that. All right. Then stage two is assessment and finding the 3D items. That's this other activity.

And there's a third stage on this, is running them. That is a different activity. That is a different activity.

So, for an auditor to do a great deal of good for a case—we had the old Class I auditing skills and Class I takes care of everything right straight up to—well, to the first introduction of the routines practically, except for those things we found are dynamite, like Step 6. In other words, anything that has been developed in Dianetics and Scientology up to the introduction of Prehav Scales—that's Class I auditing skills. Then Class II auditing skills have to do with the proper administration of a Security Check and the handling of a Problems Intensive. That is Class II auditing skills.

Now, it takes a Class III skill to run—to find, assess, locate, itemize, build up the story and run a 3D. Now, that's a Class III skill.

That's how they break down in terms of what auditors can do it. Because, let me tell you, that although it seems to be a very simple activity and there's somebody right now in upper northern Cape Town, of southern Bulawayo, or some place—there's somebody right now saying, "Oh well, that's kindergarten stuff like running a Security Check. I want to get into real auditing." They've got—they've just got it backwards.

A Security Check is real auditing. For instance, I will be talking to you more about Security Checks and you can pull more bloomers doing a Security Check than can be found in a modern gymnasium. They're innumerable. For instance, the little datum of the person—. You ask the person for any unkind thoughts, and then, you knucklehead, don't ask him for the overts that makes him think unkind thoughts. You don't recognize that on a Security Check that's just a trap. That's just a trap question. The person admits to saying— thinking some unkind thoughts.

Don't spend an hour letting him get off his unkind thoughts. What good is that going to do to him? They're all overts, every one of them. Uttering them is an overt.

No, they got a big overt back of this, man. They've got a big overt back of this. But you've got to remember something, that it may be the overt goes all the way back to their goals-terminal line. Of course, if you could pull that as a simple overt, why, I would pass you as a Security Check. But that's—there's lots of tricks to security checking and if you really want to upset a pc, why— oh, you—running a pc into an engram, leaving him stuck in the middle of having his head smashed because the executioner didn't put his head all the way through the stock on the guillotine, you know and the blade turned sideways as it came down. It was getting old and rickety and it smashed his skull in and he didn't spit in the basket properly at all and the populace all laughed. Get him right to that point, see and then don't audit it any further. Go off for a Coke or something like that.

And you frankly won't have done too much to the pc. In a few days it'll key out. Some auditor will trace some flub back to this someday, maybe. He'll trace it back as an ARC break. That's nothing

Leave a security question unflat. Now, you've got trouble, because from here on out this person goes around nattering. They go around—they feel real mean. They're real upset because you've actually slammed the auditing door in their face. We've got a staff member upstairs, a non-Scientologist, that I'm going to have to take one of these days. Somebody who left a security question unflat on the person; the person's been upset ever since. It's been going on now, for, oh, a month and a half, something like that. She's upset. She's upset. Interesting, isn't it?

So, apparently, fooling around with—with Security Checks contains far more dynamite than throwing a person down on a couch and saying, "Give me the engram necessary to resolve the case. Oh, getting your head cut off in the French Revolution. That's all right. Well, let's just go right into the moment of it. Let's not waste any time in preliminaries. Right in the moment there when your head's being cut off. Oh well, that's all right. Well, look-ahere, this is the end of session time."

Well, that could upset somebody. But not as thoroughly as missing a Security Check. Do you get the order of magnitude?

So that's—that Class II skill is not a skill to be despised.

Now furthermore, the elements of 3D are sufficiently tricky that they require very, very sharp, expert E-Metering, very, very good E-Metering and if a person isn't good enough to run a Security Check, I tell you for sure he's not good enough to assess a 3D. That's for sure, for sure, for sure.

Now, a 3D assessment is a remarkable activity and now we get into some things you didn't know. Here's some news. Now, I released, first and foremost, some procedures of assessment and how you did it and you'll find out these have been remarkably little contradicted. There's been very little change on this sort of thing I changed the commands around two or three times because I was trying to adjust how rough it could be on you and I also found out that you had to hold in the Goals Problem Mass, so therefore you got the 28th November commands changed from the original handout. You had to hold in the Goals Problem Mass by using the opposition terminal in the command.

But for two weeks, I just sweat it out. I wasn't saying anything to you, but I was just sweating it out, testing commands, testing commands, trying to find out how the hell—now that we had this thing; now that—now that this thing was sitting on the middle of the table, ready to spring—

how did we ever kick anybody through it? And I didn't put you on it till I had that pretty well whipped. Then I finally said, "Ah-huh. Here is a set of commands that goes through." Those were first issued on the 28th November command series, refined on the 29th and reissued on the 30th.

Well, if you'll notice the only adjustment is how often do you put in the opposition terminal. It's just how often. And you toughen it up on the pc in direct ratio to the number of times you put in the opposition terminal. Fifty percent of the commands can carry the opposition terminal without killing the pc. In other words, there can be one for the terminal and one for the opposition terminal, to a degree of 50 percent, without knocking the pc off. But if you exceed and say, 60 percent opposition terminal and 40 percent terminal, why just call the undertaker practically, because after a while this is just going to get too rough. It won't run out. Because you see, the allergy to the opposition terminal is resident in the terminal. It's the terminal that is upset about the opposition terminal and the only reason you have the pc running the opposition terminal at all is to hold the Problems Mass in. It's sort of an action of holding the Problems Mass in while you knock it to pieces. That's the only reason you use it at all. If you use it—use the opposition terminal not at all, your pc has the most comfortable Routine 3 run he ever had and goes no further.

He just keys out everything beautifully and you'll get up to a floating needle without the Goals Problem Mass having been touched or run out. So, one, I had to have commands that went through the Goals Problem Mass and that was asking for plenty because the person's valence is sitting, usually, resident inside their own body and it is a beefy mass and it is a tough mass and it is just full of random somatics.

It starts out, the first available is the package that the pc has always complained of as their standard somatics. And if you realize that a pc can actually exist in processing over a period of years complaining sporadically about the same set of somatics, you will recognize that no process you ran on the pc in all those years ever fazed the Goals Problem Mass.

They always complained of the same set of somatics. They were always coming up saying, "Well, I get this pain up here in my medulla oblongata and there it is. Yeah, well, I've really— I've been audited an awful lot, but this lumbosis stays with me and I'm worried about this lumbosis. And no auditor will ever listen to me about it."

This is so ordinary and routine. That's part of the Goals Problem Mass and the Goals Problem Mass makes that lumbosis, when it really starts to run, makes the lumbosis look like a mosquito landing on the back of a hand, you see? It really takes off and you've got many, many, many more combinations of somatics than that. Now, the lower off the pc is the longer it takes him to roll on up into the—the mass on the original run. But you'll get him on the—to the mass area and it starts to influence him and affect him and he'll run into it. There's no doubt about this.

You have all been bearing it out. This—this is very remarkable. It's just running off like a clock. It is just going off like a well-oiled tick-tock. It—that was the way it was mapped and that's the way you're running it and that's the way—direction it's going and that is what is happening And what kicks it through is what kicks it through and that is all there is to it. This is quite remarkable.

So, obviously, in the sheaves of papers issued beginning latter part of November and issued straight on up through to the—yesterday's issue on this, which is December the 3rd, a little more than two weeks of paper issues—the only thing that you find necessary to change about any of this is the paper that has to do with the commands.

All right. Now, let's talk for a moment about the difficulties of 3D. The first and foremost difficulty of 3D is having an auditor who is not an expert Class II. The first difficulty is with the auditor, not the pc—in all cases, with the auditor, not the pc—he has to be a very definitely, pretty confounded, cotton-picking good on an E-Meter and with Model Session and getting rudiments in and straightening it out before he will ever have any luck with a 3D.

Because those little flicks go in and out so fast and he's got to be so much on the ball. He's got to feel real familiar with what he's doing before he can also handle a pc's bank. Now, he can sort of be differentiated from the pc, don't you see, if he's doing a Security Check. He—after all, he's over here bullying that fellow over there. Well, not so, not so, you see, in a—in an assessment for a—for an item in 3D. He's got to be pretty well in there pitching with the pc. They—they've got to be on the same side of the team. I mean, there's got to be some cooperation here.

The pc has to feel very free to talk and various other factors enter in. So if the auditor at this stage of the game is not an expert and is still going through a fumble and then turns around to the pc and says, "Is this meter turned on? I can't quite tell which is the knob," the confidence is damaged.

At that moment, the pc doesn't feel quite that safety and trust and security that he should in the auditor. Actually, the pc has to be perfectly free to think about his bank, otherwise he can't be assessed. And if his attention is pulled out of session on the auditor and the inexpertness of what's happening to the auditor or with the auditor, why, the assessment is a poor show.

Because it's going to be in, it's going to be out and it's going to go null and it's going to go this way, and it's going to go that way and you're going to have to reassess and so forth.

All right. The second difficulty with 3D lies with the pc. The pc is sitting there with his load of sin and guilt. The pc is sitting there with all Westinghouse brake shoes locked, not about to go anyplace. Because if he does go anyplace then the auditor will find out that the pc was in the habit of taking little children's candy right out of their mouths throughout his entire life. You see, some serious withhold like that is liable to have to occur and "So we just can't give, you see, we don't dare talk; and we're not quite sure why we don't dare talk to this auditor," but there it is, there it is, you see? So the brakes are on because of withholds. All that sort of thing is going on.

So, as I say, the second difficulty in running a 3D lies with the pc. The first with the auditor and any inexpertness he would have in getting the pc into session, getting the pc to talk to him. The second one is the pc's unwillingness to talk, because of modern problem, the pc—of course all his problems go back to 3D items. But they can bother him so much that he can't even think about 3D, you see? And all his withholds and the pc's havingness is pretty shot, and—well, think back to the days before you had anything to do with Dianetics and Scientology and look at the mucked-up condition you were in. You get the idea.

Supposing somebody had come along and all of a sudden run an assessment on you. You know, kind of a "what wall?" proposition, you know. You'd be much more worried about the fact that you were worried than whether or not you were being looked in—somebody was looking into your whole track which you knew nothing about—"Whole track? What whole track?"

The fact that you might have been a waterbuck at some time or another would have been so thunderstrucking, you see, you'd be—everything would have gone unreal at that point, you know? You'd have had tremendous numbers of ideas in collision, don't you see? And furthermore, willingness to talk, that sort of thing—poor show. I'm not saying that so you won't think your time in Scientology has been wasted. It hasn't been wasted.

I get very bored with people that tell me auditors are harder to audit than other people. I get very bored with this, because it's just a commentary on the person making the statement. They are harder to get gains on lower processes because they've already gotten those gains. That's what that amounts to. There's a lot of tricks of the trade you can run on raw meat off the street that don't any longer work on a Scientologist because they long since have been flat. You know, there's that sort of an aspect on it.

But, now listen carefully, because you're going to need this in your business. This you're really going to need. If you're ever a Registrar in private practice in your organization, in HGC, you're going to need to know this fact and I'm delivering this fact to you, not with any idea of persuasion. We're not trying to give you a sales talk, but is—happens to be true.

If you assess somebody on 3D items for seventy-five hours and the person was not even vaguely ready to assess and the person was all blocked up with fantastic withholds and they weren't in-session at all but were halfway out of session during that entire seventy-five hours, the bulk of the seventy-five hours would have been wasted.

It would have been far more economical to have simply sat down and done a Joburg and maybe a Children's Security Check and done a Problems Intensive and straightened the person out in general, found their Havingness and Confront, patched them up on all sides, because you would have gotten something done in the seventy-five hours. And listen, seventy-five hours of assessment which winds up with no assessment, doesn't get anything done at all. Because now you're going to have to run the Joburg and the—another two or three Security Checks and a Problems Intensive and the ARC Process 61 and general O/W and—and—and. In other words, you're going to do all these preparatory processes because you realize at the end of seventy-five hours that you flubbed. The person was not ready to assess.

I have to tell you this because this is what's going to happen to you. Aloysius Doakes bursts in your front door and says, "Well, I've got to be—I— it's understood that there's a thing called assessment and I want you to find all of my 3—3 I think it is or 3X or something. It's a routine—and I think you have to find all of those items before I can be cleared and I'll—I'll—I'll—I'll let you process me if you'll just find those items and that's fine."

You'll say, "Well, I don't want this fellow to go away and he is here to be processed." And you weakly sit down and start nothing but an assessment and the hours go by and the flubs pile up and you'll find out in the rudiments you're trying to do a fantastic amount of things to get rudiments in and it's very difficult to get them in and nothing will hold in, one way or the other and you're trying to assess in the midst of all this thing and seventy-five hours later you've made no progress at all.

You're going to have to tell them flatly, "Yes, I will be happy to find these items we are talking about and clear you, providing you will agree to go through the preliminary steps of clearing and you should be able to understand that it's for no reason under the sun but your own sake that we give you the preliminary steps to clearing. And when you've gone through those preliminary steps, I'll be very happy to then find your item."

And somebody's going to be very impatient and there'll be somebody down the street who will happily find his items all wrong, without anything and mess him up like a fire drill, but that's man's willingness to commit suicide, but you can warn him about that sort of thing, because it's frankly true.

Now, if you—if you are the only one around that can do any assessment and you've got a lot of people around who can do other types of things, a case can be prepared to be assessed.

You could have the case prepared to be assessed and then, when you were absolutely sure that none of the Form 3 questions reacted, that a good job was done on this, that this thing was pretty well cleaned up, the person's ARC processes were all flat and all that sort of thing and their general O/W and things done, then you can sail in and brrrt-boom-boom-boom. Get your rudiments in and bang-bang-bang-bang You'll all of a sudden find that 3D will fall out in your lap.

But it falls out to the degree the case has been prepared for it and this is going to be a very hard one to sell, I'm afraid, because here and there, there is a case that is ready to be assessed for 3D, that you could just sit down and get all of these items, just brrrt-brrrt-brrrt-brrrt-brrrt, see? Here and there, there is such a case and that will tend to give us all the lie, don't you see.

But usually the case is in that shape because they've been processed for the last eight years. Processed very successfully and everything is fine. Of course, they're ready for that sort of thing.

And then, of course, there's some starry-eyed person off the street that hasn't gotten much in the way of withholds and they're just sort of okay anyhow and you get the 3D items in seven or eight hours and so forth. That makes a liar out of this thing, you see? But they're not in the majority, I'm sure you will find. And the majority of them, if you don't demand these initial stages, wow, you're just going to just break your heart. That's all there is to it. You're just going to break your heart trying to get these items.

The reads are very tiny and they—they—everything goes null. And then you get them in again and then they all go null. And then you get them in again and they all go null. It's all on whether or not you can keep rudiments in on the pc, you see? That's the only thing it counts for. If you can keep the rudiments in easily you can do a fairly rapid assessment.

If you're going to have any difficulty keeping the rudiments in on a pc, you shouldn't be assessing them. You should be preparing them to be assessed. And that'll save you a lot of time.

Now, what would happen? At the end of seventy-five hours what do you wind up with? You wind up with a case prepared to be assessed. Ah, but if you assessed them for seventy-five hours, what do you wind up with? You wind up with a lost seventy-five hours, because you're going to have to do all the preparatory work before you dare run them, anyhow. Because the rudiments have got to be in on a run. If anything, it's more important to have rudiments in on a 3D run than it is on a 3D assessment.

Of course, it's more visible to you that they must be in on an assessment. But wait till you—wait till you've seen somebody's 3D tone arm go up and stick and then you change level, you run some Havingness, you're going to run the next level and the tone arm doesn't come down and nothing happens, and you realize what's going on there—the rudiments are out in some fashion or another. Something's happened. Pc has had a PT problem or something is wrong here, definitely wrong It causes the 3D to hang up and it causes more duress than it should. Now, it does—it doesn't mean, you see, that all the duress in a 3D run is caused by the rudiments being out. This is not true. The duress in a 3D run is caused by the 3D items. But the more able the pc is at the time he is running them, the more easily these items are handled and the less duress the pc goes through.

Now, you could ARC break a pc, make sure the pc had a big present time problem and make sure the pc's havingness was out the bottom. Now, having made sure of those three points, we plunge into the middle of a level run. That pc's going to have about—magnitude of somatics two and three times over what they would have.

It doesn't mean the somatics would be light in any case. It just means they're tougher. See, you're dealing with an area there that is so tough anyway, you're liable to get careless. You say, "Well, it half kills him anyway, so that's that. You know, so what?"

It's marvelous, though, how they'll sit there being half-killed. That's what's interesting You always know this about a working process. If the process is going to get anyplace, the pc will go any—through anything to complete it. You know, I hadn't had anybody offer to blow yet on a 3D one, except a person who had been run backwards. A person whose oppterm had been run on an earlier 3—on an earlier run—the oppterm had been run for the terminal and they were sort of thinking of blowing. But they were—what—what was really blowing around there was the winds of space.

Now, let's make some—a few comments here on assessment before we finish up this thing. Let's get in something very practical at this stage.

One: The auditor has to know what he's doing with the E-Meter and know what he's looking for and so forth. Given that fact, you can always get a 3D set of items. There's one item been added onto this, not because you need it. You don't need this item, except to get the story. You probably will never use this one item I'm just about to tell you about, but sometimes it is the pc's goal. So you always get the oppterm's goal. Not its goal in relationship to the pc's goal, but the actual goal of the opposition terminal.

Let us say the opposition terminal was a dog. Now, we've asked, "Who or what would oppose your goal of saving bones?" And we eventually will get the goal, you see, of the dog. "What would be a dog's goal?" and so forth. Well, "to save bones." And this is very difficult and so forth and we start looking this thing over and it appears rather peculiar to us. "Let's see, her goal is 'to save bones'. " This doesn't always occur to us right away. So, we get a dog's goal. You see, we've got the dog. Now, we get the dog's goal. Not in opposition to anything, but let's just rack up and get a dog's goal. It doesn't take us long to get the thing and we've got it. And in some cases, why, we'll find ourselves sitting there looking at the pc's goal. Ha-ha-ha-ha. It doesn't add up the other way; it adds up this way beautifully. The pc's goal was "to save bones." And the dog's goal was "to save bones." What do you know? Isn't that interesting? We didn't have the opposition terminal at all; we had the pc, see?

So by asking for the goal and getting the actual goal of the opposition terminal whenever it turns up, we occasionally wind up with the fact that our 3D is backwards. Now, the thing to do with a 3D is to get all the elements, regardless. And that is an additional element that you don't need in eventual runs or anything but it helps you sort it out. So you just—any time you get an item on 3D, why, get everything in relationship to that item and you'll eventually get the whole story rather easily. You won't be fumbling in the dark for it.

You can enter a 3D series of items on assessment anywhere. You can enter it anywhere. Given one item you can get the remainder.

Now, let's say—this is very handy to know—somebody has been cleared and they're still keyed-out beautifully and they never get any needle action and everything is fine. Only you happen to know that they were run on some goal that they can't remember but the terminal was "a whiz cat." That's the earliest record we can find of their first terminal. That's very important to find out. It's worth metering and sitting on their heads and cabling auditors and doing everything else to find the first terminal this person was run on and the first goal. Well, maybe we had no record of the goal but we have a whiz cat. We can always put the goal back in, don't you see?

Now, we get the opposition terminal to a whiz cat and it'll react beautifully. And we get the opposition goal, don't you see. And we can patch it back up and even arrive back at the pc's goal and then we'd know whether or not the thing was still balanced up. We'd get a modifier and we've got the lot. But it all entered in from a whiz cat, the original terminal. Of course, the terminal has been flattened, see? It doesn't exist anymore. But we've got to assess our 3D from the first terminal run on that case. And you'll find out there's plenty of kick in the opposition terminal to a whiz cat. That's still jumping That's still live, see? You can find that rather easily.

All right. Let's say we could get the goal but we couldn't get anything else. We couldn't get the original first terminal or something like that or we didn't trust the original first terminal. Let's say a case ran a long time and didn't run clear, and we had the goal and the terminal of the person but the terminal was run for a long time and we don't know anything about that.

Well, we could take the goal and we could get an opposition goal; not a terminal that would oppose that goal, but we could just get an opposition goal. What idea would oppose that? And we make a list of the ideas that would oppose it; assess. We wind up with the oppgoal. All right. Very good. Now we take the oppgoal. Now, let's try to get a modifier to this oppgoal. Wherever it came from, let's try to get a modifier to the oppgoal.

Now, that sounds like a funny thing to do, but it will wind us up with a very easy, fast route in to getting the opposition terminal. See, whatever it was. In other words, we just keep adding parts. Any kind of a part that you can get ahold of, why, add all of the additional parts to it that could possibly be checked out.

See, all of its opposition, all of its complementary parts—if you get a goal of any kind, try to get a modifier for the goal and then a terminal for that goal and modifier, and you'll wind up with the proper short run to a terminal. All right. Now that you've got the terminal, now you can get the opposition terminal to that terminal and of course, you've got the oppterm now. And now does this check back across to the goal, see? And we find out very often that we have the whole thing backwards after we've got it all figured out.

But unless we've got to—the additional parts we don't know that we've got it backwards, you see? That's how it finally proves up. All of a sudden we just find ourselves sitting at it if we've got enough data.

For instance, we've got the pc's goal. Pc's goal: "to bury bones." Opposition goal: "to sing beautiful songs." It doesn't sound right to us. Opposition pc's goal: "to bury bones," you see? Opposition terminal: "dog" Goal of the dog: "to sing beautiful songs." Pc's terminal turns out to be "cat." To bury bones. Cat. To bury bones. Ha-ha-ha-ha. No, let's take this up with the pc. Let's go into conference on the thing.

Has he ever really wanted to be a cat? Has he ever really wanted to be a dog?

"Well, I never thought of that before, but you know—ahem, I—ahem, hm—hrm—hrm.

Well, we've gotten items all right, but they haven't come in the proper order because... Remember we're getting them out of somebody who is caught between two tractors, see? He's caught between the bumpers of two tractors and he is scrambled. He doesn't know which tractor's which. See, he will happily put the opposition goal with the pc's goal and—he'd put them together as modifier and goal, if you left it up to him. You get through at the other end. Sometimes the test on it is simply to chant what you think is the opposition terminal at him.

You say, "Well, you uh—now, you say you uh—you've often wanted to be a waterbuck— wanted to be one. All right. That's fine. Waterbuck. Waterbuck. Waterbuck. What would a

waterbuck be doing? Would a waterbuck be doing a lot of things?" Just watching the pc, you see. "Would a waterbuck be doing a lot of things? What would a waterbuck be doing? Waterbuck dance or anything like that? Waterbuck drink water?" and so forth. Just watch the pc.

Is the pc going backwards on the winds of space, see? Is he getting something wrong with his eyes or getting a little sensation?

And then take "tiger," see. And you say, "Well, all right. Now, what would a tiger be doing? What would a tiger be doing?"

And the pc says, "Well, not sure. Not sure what a tiger would be doing, as a matter of fact."

It becomes very obvious to you that the pc is very comfortable as a tiger and very uncomfortable as a waterbuck. There's something blowing his head off every time you say "waterbuck." Well, waterbuck obviously is the opposition terminal, regardless of what the pc thinks about it.

And more often than not, you operating independently, with nobody riding your heels, you're going to find opposition terminals which are actually the pc's terminals. You're going to find goals which are the opposition goals. You're going to find it all backwards.

So I'm just pointing out to you that you're given any part of a 3D which checks out. You've got just one part of a 3D. You've got a terminal. And you weren't quite sure of the goal; it was flickery and everything was sort of weak. But eventually we got down to a terminal and oh, man, this terminal is really it. I mean, it reads well and it's strong and the pc is right in there. Boy, it really is some kind of a terminal, of some kind or another. It belongs someplace to something.

Now, it might not be the terminal at all, but you can criss-cross. You can find more parts. You can find things that suddenly do add up and all of a sudden it all straightens out for you. And you find the terminal was a terminal, but it was the opposition terminal. You assessed from the opposition terminal as the pc's terminal. See, it didn't make sense until you got all the parts.

So just make this reservation about a 3D assessment. If you can find one part, then you can find any other item. Not necessarily in order, don't you understand? It's not in order. But you can find some other item. It doesn't matter what rotation or what order you find the item in; you got one item. Let's say you got a—you got a name that serves as a terminal. All right. You can certainly find a goal for it; you can find an opposition terminal; you can find a lot of items for this terminal. Don't you see?

All right. Let's say you have a goal. You can certainly find the opposition goal and then the opposition terminal, see? Then we could find a modifier. We could find another terminal. You see? It—it's sort of like the wheel of fortune. If you find any point on the spokes, you can find some other spokes, and eventually it turns out to be a wheel. And you thought it was a square soapbox all the time.

And the other point is, is never make up your mind about the story until you've got the whole thing. Always just sit there, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, agreeing with the pc on anything he says, but reserving yourself the fact that when we've got all items found, now, we're going to make this up and make sure that it all fits and we've got it all straight in all categories—that the pc is this terminal, that this is not the opposition terminal. Because the time to find it out is before you run the first level, not afterwards. So your various tests, and so forth, that are applied, are applied in that order and direction and that's the way you do it.

But given any item on a 3D—any single item; it doesn't matter what it is—you can find the rest of the 3D from it. Not necessarily in order or sequence, but you can patch it together from that point and you finally wind up with maybe two or three extra items. Well, you have to decide if they're extra, you know? You're often winding up with extra modifiers; how about someday winding up with an extra terminal. That would be embarrassing, wouldn't it?

But it might happen; it might happen. You might have a terminal from a second goal and it might be checking out just gorgeously. I've already seen it happen. Only it checks out with an entirely different pattern of needle motion. It doesn't follow the same pattern of needle motion with the pc's goal.

Pc's goal rock slams and this other one theta bops very nicely. One terminal rock slams, one terminal theta bops, the pc's goal rock slams, so that's the terminal you take, of course, between the choice between the two. The other one belongs to some other goal chain.

You can get more than one thing to hang up on a Goals Assessment. But if you've got any doubt about it at all, just go ahead, find more items. That's the rule. Criss-cross it and find more items. Just say, "Well, we were never too sure of this terminal. We never knew quite what this terminal was all about. Let's find some opposition terminals to it. We never knew whether the pc was it or something else. Well, let's find some opposition terminals to it. All right. Let's find a goal for that opposition terminal now. Not an opposition goal, but let's just find a goal for it."

And sure enough, all of a sudden the thing falls together. But keep working with the 3D until you are sure that it makes sense. That's the rule. Don't just add up, well, five items and there we got five items so therefore in the item we put them down it makes that kind of sense and we'll run it. Because you'll have a lose, sooner or later, doing that.

You'll have the opposition terminal, which is actually the pc's terminal and the opposition goal is actually the pc's goal. And you can actually have the pc's goal matched up with the opposition terminal. The pc's terminal is the opposition terminal. The pc's goal is his goal.

The pc's terminal is listed by you as the opposition terminal and the opposition goal is the goal of the terminal you found for the pc and you won't notice it right down to the last moment. It looks almost right, you know? It just looks just fine, except it really doesn't. There's just something a bit wrong here someplace. We just can't imagine a wood pigeon—a wood pigeon being overly excited and so forth, about drill presses. Somehow or another the two don't quite match.

And what you—the way you resolve it is not sitting around scratching yourself bald. The thing to do, of course, is just find some more items. See if you can find any item cross to any other item. We've already got all five items.

All right. Now, just out of viciousness, find the goal for what you've got listed as an opposition terminal. It's the sixth item. Not an opposition goal; it's just a goal. Let's find that.

And now, having found that goal, if we are still doubtful, maybe we can find a modifier for it, of some kind or another. And then we find a terminal for that goal and modifier but we've already got two terminals here. Let's see if we find a third one.

Ah, well, all of a sudden the thing makes sense across the boards because it's mixed. In other words, you can keep finding items and keep cross-checking till it all goes straight. And you're happy about it and the pc's happy about it and everybody is cheerful about it and there is love in all directions, right up to the moment when you come up to the first stuck tone arm and the pc says, "My head feels like it's bursting What is happening? I have some terrible somatics."

And you say, "Good, thank you," and start in with another level.

The pc wonders whether or not this will ever deteriorate, if it will ever go away.

At that moment, much more than an assessment, does he begin to wonder, "Am I in safe hands? Because I never before had a process that pushed me through a wall and cracked the bricks and I'm sure the bricks behind me are cracked."

I've also had this type of reaction: "No force could be as great as the force which is being experienced in that ridge at this moment. There is no force that great. And if it just goes just one little eighteen-millionth of an inch closer, why, that will be the end of everything" And, of course, it goes half an inch closer and it doesn't end everything—anything But the point is, the pc has to have very high trust and this is no time to straighten out a 3D, see?

It's the wrong time to straighten out a 3D. I can see it now. You've got the winds of—of space blowing madly, the pc's eyes are two burning holes, you can practically look through the back of his skull with them, you know? He's blowing to pieces and you say, casually, "I wonder if I have these items right."

I don't think that's the—I think it would cause an ARC break. But it is quite interesting that before you run the first run or assess for the first Prehav level, how endlessly a pc will take all these items up with you. They're still very interested and they'll take them up and sort them out and sort them out. And just by the basis of sorting them out and discussing them and so forth, why, all of a sudden the thing will right itself, for them and for you and so forth. It doesn't matter much whether it rights it for them or not. It's the auditor that counts. That's a fact. It's the auditor who must be satisfied, not the pc. The pc—I've seen pcs with such glee run the opposition terminal that I don't wonder at the number of suicides there are on Earth.

It's—it's just marvelous. They say, "Oh my, that's just gorgeous. Yes, there is no doubt about it." It's touched their pride, you see? It's touched their pride. You say, "Oh, I've always been a tiger. Yes, I remember very vividly. Always a tiger, always a tiger. I've always been thinking of myself as a tiger." Back goes their head and that's it. They're a waterbuck.

But they've—they've almost taken the—the push through, don't you see? They've almost—they've almost handed in their chips and accepted the opposition, you see, as a brother and partner. It's just like the Laborite government here. It's almost accepted Conservatism as its level of action; they've been fighting it so long.

Well, there is some notes on 3D, some material on 3D. I hope it has increased your understanding of it.

One other thing: I don't want you to be afraid of 3D. That is the one thing which I would like to impress on you. Don't—and I don't want you to worry about a 3D, doing a 3D assessment. It is not a matter of worry. I'll tell you what it is a matter of.

You're assessing some pc. Your amount of worry on it isn't going to do you any good, whatsoever. What is going to do some good is getting a list and assessing it and doing it expertly. Getting—you—get your rudiments in. Get a list for some item and assess it and wind up with one.

That—that takes a mechanical action and that's the action which you must be able to do accurately. Don't worry about it, because if you have entered upon the edge of worrying about it, the way to undo your worry is just get some more items, get some extraneous items.

Say, "Well, let's see. We've got a terminal here and we don't know whether it's the terminal or not and we don't know whether it matches the whizzits or not and we don't know what this was all about."

Well, you've never asked the pc this burning question: "Who would oppose that terminal? Who would oppose it? All right." And take a long list of the things that oppose it and assess the list. Well, you've already got his opposition terminal, don't you see?

Or we take his opposition terminal. We say, "There's something wrong here someplace." Take his opposition terminal. Say, "What would oppose this? Who or what would oppose this terminal?" And get a whole new terminals list. Well, we already got the pc's terminal, but to get a whole new terminals list. Assess the thing down. You'll come up with either another one or the pc's own or you 11 come up with the fact that they are reversed. You'll come up with different data. In other words, you can develop this data and you can prove it out by further assessment any time you want to.

There's no sense in worrying about it, because in the final analysis it is not ever equivocal. It's something that you can recognize vividly.